University of Alberta

The State, Globalization and Canadian Universities: Theoretical Reflections on Social Differentiation and Commercialization in the Academy

by

Korbla Peter Puplampu

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Education

in

International and Global Education

Department of Educational Policy Studies

Edmonton, Alberta

Spring 2003

National Library of Canada
Acquisitions and Bibliographic Services
395 Wellington Street
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada
Acquisitions et services bibliographiques
395, rue Wellington
Ottawa ON K1A 0N4
Canada

Your file Votre référence

Our file Notre référence

The author has granted a non-exclusive licence allowing the National Library of Canada to reproduce, loan, distribute or sell copies of this thesis in microform, paper or electronic formats.

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque nationale du Canada de reproduire, prêter, distribuer ou vendre des copies de cette thèse sous la forme de microfiche/film, de reproduction sur papier ou sur format électronique.

The author retains ownership of the copyright in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

0-612-82228-1

Canada

University of Alberta

Library Release Form

Name of Author: Korbla Peter Puplampu

Title of Thesis: The State, Globalization and Canadian Universities: Theoretical Reflections on Social Differentiation and Commercialization in the Academy

Degree: Master of Education

Year this Degree Granted: 2003

Permission is hereby granted to the University of Alberta Library to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves all other publication and other rights in association with the copyright in the thesis, and except as herein before provided, neither the thesis nor any substantial portion thereof may be printed or otherwise reproduced in any material form whatever without the author's prior written permission.

102-10625 83 Ave
Edmonton - Alberta
T6E 2E3

Dec. 12, 2002
Date

University of Alberta

Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled ***The State, Globalization and Canadian Universities: Theoretical Reflections on Social Differentiation and Commercialization in the Academy*** submitted by ***Korbla Peter Puplampu*** in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of ***Master of Education*** in ***International and Global Education.***

André P. Grace

Dr. André P. Grace
(Supervisor)

Dr. Jerrold L. Kachur

Dr. Satoshi Ikeda

October 17, 2002

Date

Dedication

With warm affection, this thesis is dedicated to the two ladies in my life, Nuerki, who continues to make a whole lot of things possible, and Adiki, who reminds me that going to the swing-set is a better activity than doing my homework.

Abstract

In a knowledge-driven twenty-first century, institutions propagating knowledge have assumed a renewed importance. Institutions of higher education (universities and colleges) are significant examples in that regard. Canadian universities, as public institutions of higher education, rely on state revenue to carry out their mandate. In the last two decades, however, globalization, as a concept and a theoretical phenomenon, has engendered dramatic changes in the state's role in education and, subsequently, the nature and organization of higher education. This study examines the relationship among the state, globalization and public universities in Canada. The study shows the impact of globalization on universities and analyzes the incidence of social differentiation among the ranks of the academy, and trends towards the commercialization of knowledge production and propagation. The study contends that these changes, while turning university teaching and research into just another market operation, have worrisome implications for educators, learners and society at large.

Acknowledgement

Scholarship is a co-operative exercise, and I consider it a privilege to have obtained the help of several people in the preparation of this study. First, I thank God for the grace and strength throughout this program. I also want to thank Professor Andre Grace, my supervisor, for his help, guidance and encouragement. Furthermore, I am also grateful to Professors Jerrold Kachur and Satoshi Ikeda, members of the examining committee, for their useful comments. Abra Mawusi also deserves thanks for secretarial assistance in the course of writing up the study. Despite the help of the above mentioned people, I am solely responsible for any errors in the presentation of facts and or flaws in the interpretation of data.

Table of Contents

Chapter 1 1
INTRODUCTION 1
A. Introduction 1
B. Research Objectives and Conceptual Issues 9
C. Theoretical Focus and Significance of Study 23
D. Organization of Study and Source of Data 27
E. Conclusion 29

Chapter 2 30
THE STATE, GLOBALIZATION AND HIGHER EDUCATION:
A THEORETICAL REVIEW 30
A. Introduction 30
B. The State, Differentiation, Commercialization and Higher Education:
A Brief History 30
C. Proponents of Market-Driven Initiatives 36
D. Opponents of Market-Driven Initiatives 43
E. Critique and An Alternative Framework 48
F. Conclusion 62

Chapter 3 63
THE STATE, SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND
COMMERCIALIZATION 63
A. Introduction 63
B. The State and Higher Education 63
C. Part-Time Instructors and the Academy 72
D. Non-State Actors and the Academy 91
E. Conclusion 108

Chapter 4 110
SUMMARY AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS 110
A. Summary 110
B. Policy Recommendations. 112

REFERENCES 119

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

A. The Problem

It is not an exaggeration to argue that education plays an important role in national development. While the primary and secondary levels are critical in terms of creating an educated society, tertiary or higher education is key in providing the human and intellectual capacity necessary to ensure that the knowledge base of the country is not only sustained but also utilized to resolve societal concerns. The tertiary institutions of importance in this study are universities and colleges, specifically their teaching, research and overall contribution to national or international development.

The UNESCO forum, The International Commission on Education for the Twenty-first Century, emphasised the relevance of universities, in particular, to development:

> [U]niversities have a decisive role to play. In [both developed and] developing countries, universities must learn from their own past and analyse their own countries' difficulties, engaging in research aimed at finding solutions to the most acute among them. It is also incumbent on them to propose a renewed vision of development that will enable their countries to build a genuinely better future (UNESCO, 1996:28).

It is in view of this fundamental role of the university in societal improvement that the state or governments in almost every country, irrespective of level of development or ideological orientation, are interested in promoting institutions of higher learning. This is also the context in which the state's role in, or the politics of, higher education can best be situated.

In Canada, as in many other countries, the federal government supports universities and colleges, as public institutions, with funds. Within the Canadian context,

education falls under provincial jurisdiction. This does not suggest that the federal government of Canada does not play any role in higher education (See Polster, 1996:108). Indeed, the federal government, through transfer payments to the provinces, plays an indirect or oversight role in trying to maintain a more or less uniform national standard of higher education in the country. There are several federal government research granting councils (for example, the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council) and other departments and agencies (Canadian International Development Agency) that support the work of higher education. The Federal government could also set up and fund special programs for higher education (the Millennium Scholarship Fund and the Chairs of Excellence are two recent examples of federal "intrusion" into higher education). The federal government, according to some estimates, provides about 76 per cent of direct funding to universities (Fisher and Rubenson, 1998:77).

State involvement in financing higher education in Canada was not noticeable in the early history of higher education in Canada since some Canadian universities predate Confederation. The early history of higher education in Canada shows that it was dominated by religious organizations. The contest was among the Anglican, Catholic, Presbyterian and Methodist Churches. The religious organization that prevailed or established a university used it as a form of social and political capital. By playing a dominant role in institutions of higher learning, religious denominations influenced what was constructed as knowledge and, by extension, excluded ways of knowing that contradicted their religious principles. For example, the Baptist Acadia University, even in the twentieth century, ignored Darwin's theory of evolution because it was considered "anti-Christian" (Moody, 1989:150). Thus, "[f]or almost two hundred years, Canadian

higher education was dominated by the work of denominational institutions" (Jones, 1998:6). This situation was, however, complemented by the rise of secular or public universities in the latter part of the 1800s.

As far as moves to secularize universities were concerned, the University Bill of 1843 introduced by Robert Baldwin is significant (Adams, 1968:64-66). An earlier bill in 1837, introduced by John Strachan, supported the role of religious institutions in university education (Adams, 1968:11). It is important to note that Robert Baldwin's bill, although defeated, did not prevent another University Act in 1849, which established the University of Toronto as a secular institution (Adams, 1968:11). With Confederation in 1867, state support for universities in Canada started to evolve gradually. The attempt, for example, to avoid the ongoing feud among religious denominations and their control of educational institutions provided the entry point for secular, publicly funded institutions of higher learning; as was the case with the founding of the University of Manitoba in 1877 (See Morton, 1979).

Government involvement in public education, and in this case higher education, was seen as one of the key areas that would lead to the training of people who could undertake clear and independent thinking, analysis and problem solving at the highest level. Public education would also create the disciplined and reliable labour force required for industrialization and ultimately national development. Hence the federal and provincial or territorial levels of government in Canada, like many others, do not hesitate in funding universities in order to create the requisite labour force, in the name of national development (Green, 1997).

Events such as the 1930s Great Depression and the post second world war (1939-1945) reconstruction effort, further justified state support of universities. The latter period, in particular, guided by the Keynesian model of development, favoured an active state in the economic and social arenas. Especially for areas such as national defense, public utilities and services that were susceptible to the free-rider exploitation; the state was seen as the only viable institution that would take charge. The state therefore continued to support higher education with the required resources.

However, in the last two decades, hardly a day passes by without policy makers justifying or advocating a policy in which the state is supposed to play a minimal role in institutions of higher learning. In Canada and many other nations, both rich and poor, the argument has been something along the following lines: the winds of globalization blowing over the globe demand that governments restructure the nature and role of social institutions in order to stay competitive. Thus, policy makers present policies advocated in the name of globalization as inevitable and also argue that for such policies to be successful they need to touch on every facet of the society structure, especially, publicly funded institutions. Hence, the restructuring of Canadian institutions of higher education in the last two decades.

The broader context for the restructuring exercise was the political and economic events that began with the election of successive Conservative governments in Canada between 1984 and 1993. That era of Conservative rule in Canada also coincided with similar governments in the United States of America and Britain. These conservative governments, within the context of the global depression of the early 1980s, launched a neo-liberal attack on the economy. To address the prevailing inflation and the fiscal crisis

of the state, neo-liberal policies called for a minimal role for the state in economic activities. The Conservative governments also took steps to address instabilities in the international financial system, caused by, among other things, the high debt level of many developing countries. These moves saw the emergence of the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund as major supervisors in the restructuring of international financial transactions. The stress on a minimal role of the state was complemented by calls for an enhanced role of the private sector and market forces. In emphasizing the importance of markets, the argument was that state involvement in the economy introduced political and other considerations and created distortions in the allocation of resources and rewards. Market forces, it was presumed, would be able to remove distortions and present the best mechanism in the allocation of resources and rewards.

The World Bank (1998:22) presented university restructuring as

> either fewer and/or different faculty, professional staff, and support workers. This means lay-offs, forced early retirements, or major retraining and reassignment, as in: the closure of inefficient, or ineffective institutions; the merger of quality institutions that merely lack the critical mass of operations to make them cost-effective; and the radical alteration of the mission and production function of an institution – which means radically altering who the faculty are, how they behave, the way they are organized, and the way they work and are compensated.

One major issue emanating from globalization is the cutback in funding to universities and other public institutions. Governments, historically the custodians of public interest, now have to cut or reduce their funding to universities.

Since the state has been the major source of funds for universities in Canada, changes in its role, not surprisingly, have also affected its ability to adequately fund universities. For example, federal and provincial transfer payments to universities and colleges declined more than 20 per cent and 12 per cent respectively in 1999/2000 (with

1992/93 as base year) (CAUT Education Review, 2000a). The funding situation did not improve in the subsequent years. Levels for 2000/2001 were 3.2 per cent lower than 1999-2000. Another significant point is the differential levels of funding among the various provinces and territories.

Amongst the provinces in 2000/01, for example, government expenditures on post-secondary education were highest in Quebec, Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and lowest in Ontario and Prince Edward Island. Funding in all provinces remains 27% below 1992/93 levels (CAUT Education Review, 2000b). The same source also indicates that the biggest declines over this period occurred in two of the so-called four "have" provinces, Ontario (-44%), Alberta (-37%); and Prince Edward Island (-26%). Ontario, Canada's richest province, spends a third less per capita university operating grants than the so-called "have not" province of Newfoundland and Labrador, and its spending was 20% below the national average (CAUT Education Review, 2000b, See also Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, 2002, 2001). The changes in the rate of funding to higher education across Canada, not surprisingly, have compelled universities and colleges to seek extra sources of funds.

In order to maintain their traditions of excellence in teaching and research, which continue to increase in demand, universities and colleges have devised and implemented a number of strategies to cope with shortfalls in funding with the hope of still providing quality service. The strategies, consistent with views of the World Bank (1998), include eliminating some departments, or amalgamating others, increasing tuition fees, redeploying support staff, inducing long-time full-time or tenure-track professors to buy into early retirement packages. The others are relying increasingly on part-time

instructors under all kinds of categories (for example, permanent part-time, sessional instructors, term instructors), vigorously attempting to raise funds from alumni, and forging new alliances with for-profit seeking organizations, both small and large. Other sources of funding are from wealthy individuals or families. Two of these strategies, the increasing reliance on part-time academic labourers and the renewed role of for-profit organizations in the academy are the focus of this study.

Analysts have showed how diminished government funding has led to the marketization of higher education in Canada, resulting in part-time academic labourers and for-profit organizations in the academy (Frankman, 2000; Turk, 2000; Tudiver, 1999; Buchbinder and Rajapogal, 1996; Newson, 1994). There is a paucity of data on the number of part-time instructors in Canada, because "too few universities have completed Statistics Canada's annual survey on part-time faculty" (Turk, 2000:8). However, anecdotal evidence suggests that the patterns for part-time instructors in Canada are similar to those in the United States of America, where "part-time and non-tenure-track contract appointments now constitute more than half of all faculty" especially in the humanities and social science disciplines (Turk, 2000:8; see also Cox, 2000). In Canada, as in the United States, the concentration of part-time instructors varies from institution to instruction and discipline areas. Turk (2000:8) cites the case of Royal Roads University in Victoria, British Columbia, Canada, which hires a dozen "core" faculty on renewable fixed term appointments and a much larger pool of "associate faculty" who teach single courses. It is, however, important to stress that all institutions of higher education in Canada, either large or small, make use of part-time instructors.

Writing about the "private and public lives of Canadian universities," Fisher and Rubenson (1998) draw our attention to internal differentiation in institutions of higher learning. The source of this internal differentiation, they argue, can be found in the disagreements over the appropriate importance of the divisions among the teaching, research and community activities of university teachers. Part of the disagreement stems from the view by some faculty members that teaching is a "load" while research is an "opportunity." The issue here is the long-standing debate in academia about which is more important - teaching or research. Put differently, which garners the most power, rewards and prestige? The "publish or perish" slogan suggests that a lot more power, rewards and prestige accrue from research and publication than from teaching.

The current arrival of corporations in the academy, as Oliveri (2000), Brill-Edwards (2000) and Clark (2000) have persuasively argued, does not augur well for disinterested research. When "money and truth collide (Oliveri, 2000:53), one would surely be hurt more than the other (See also Thompson, Baird, and Downie, 2001). The emerging analysis seems to suggest that in the collision, truth would be the casualty. In any case, the mission of universities and their mandate are all likely to be negatively affected. The University of Toronto, for example, terminated David Healy's appointment as Clinical Director of the Mood and Anxiety Program with the Centre of Addiction and Mental and as Professor of Psychiatry, following his critical remarks about the role of the pharmaceutical industries in research. The action suggests the nature of the harm that can be inflicted on the academy when money and truth collide (CAUT, 2002a).[1] The rejection

---

1
However, the University of Toronto has recently given Healy an appointment as a Visiting Professor (See Chapter 3).

by the administration of Simon Fraser University of the appointment of David Noble to the James S. Woodsworth Chair in Humanities, it seems, had little to do with Noble's credentials and a lot more to do with the politics of his academic work.[2]

In view of the preceding comments, this study attempts to answer the following questions: Does social differentiation within academia support the contention that the market is the impersonal mechanism that fairly allocates rewards? Who are likely to take on the teaching "load" while others pursue their research "opportunities"? What might be the implications for disinterested research when the sponsors of the research premise their contribution on future profits? What are the implications of the "free-market model" for the restructuring of higher education? The study will also address the implications of the above questions for educators, learners, knowledge production and propagation, within the context of differentiation and commercialization in the academy.

B. Research Objectives and Conceptual Issues

This study is theoretical, in the sense that, it examines the theoretical implications of the restructuring of higher education with respect to differentiation of academic labour and commercialization of the academy. The study engages the literature on the restructuring of higher education against the background of the on-going debate for and against the free-market. This study has two-related aims. The first is to isolate or

---

2
A Professor of History at York University in Toronto, David Noble has done extensive and critically acclaimed work on the historical, political, economic and social dimensions of technologies. He is critical of the current trends in higher education in which technology is seen as both the means and an end in the teaching and research mandates of institutions of higher education. Not surprisingly, the Canadian Association of Union

delineate how the respective changes under the rubric of globalization have affected educational policies, particularly the role of state and non-state actors in the making of educational policies. The second aim is to analyze how universities have responded to the changes in educational policies and the implications of that response to the mandate of universities as sites for teaching, research and community engagement. Specifically, the study examines the emerging differentiation of academic labourers and the commercialization in the academy.

The study is guided by a number of concepts. The operational definition of each concept will be followed by a brief theoretical overview. The concepts and their operational definitions are as follows:

- The state and its institutions: The state, in this study, will be conceptualized not only in terms of a central political site, either at the federal or provincial level, but also in terms of how that site interacts with the variety of interest groups in the making and unmaking of educational and related policies. Even though there is no national department of education in Canada, the federal government, together with its provincial counterparts, provides the policy framework for higher education. Thus, for example, Alberta Learning is the state educational institution in the Province of Alberta and sets the policy direction for higher education in the Province.
- Non-state institutions: these institutions are generally private and, theoretically speaking, operate independently of the state institutions. There are two major types of non-state institutions of interest here. The first are non-profit ones like the Fraser Institute, the Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives and the University of Alberta-

---

Teachers (CAUT) cried foul and accused the university of a hiring bias (CAUT, 2001a; See Chapter 3).

based Parkland Institute. The second are the for-profit ones. Examples include Coca Coca, a multinational beverage company and Telus Communications, a tele-communication giant in Canada with roots in Alberta.

- Educational and related policies: directives, from the state or non-state institutions that directly or indirectly affect educational institutions.
- Universities: post-secondary institutions devoted to the production and dissemination of ideas and values towards a better understanding of society.
- Academic labourers: the people whose work involve the generation of the ideas (knowledge production, exchange, and distribution) and values relevant for an understanding of society.
- Commercialization or commodification: any transaction that involves the buying and selling of goods and services, and aims at generating a profit. The profit, in many cases, does not go the individual, but rather to the institution. However, there are some cases where the individual can secure a sizeable share of the profit.
- Knowledge production and propagation: the ideas, beliefs, values and practices that academic labourers have proposed towards a better understanding of social relationships.
- Globalization: an interactive historical process that involves political, economic and social relationships among nations. Integrative in nature, globalization is supposed to inform the policy process in a way that cannot be controlled by the policy makers.

The brief operational definitions above are informed by the theoretical overview that follows.

Even though social and political theorists have grappled with the state's role in society since Thomas Hobbes wrote *Leviathan* in the seventeenth century, there is no agreement on the conceptual attributes and activities of the state. Scholars, in accordance with their ideological and methodological dispositions, have been arguing heatedly over the attributes and activities of the state. To a large extent, the work of Karl Marx and his colleague Friedrich Engels, and that of Max Weber have influenced much of the scholarly debate on the state.

Marx and Engels highlighted the state's role in mediating conflict between social groups, generally represented by the owners of capital and labour. Engels, writing after the death of Marx, argued that since "the state arose from the need to keep class antagonisms in check ... the modern representative state is an instrument for exploiting wage labour by capital" (Engels, 1986:210). Thus, Marxian theorists conceptualize the state as an institution representing the interests of the powerful sections of society.

Max Weber conceptualized the state in terms of its institutional character, its rule making functions and monopoly over the use of legitimate force in enforcing its orders (Gerth and Mills, 1946:78). From a Weberian perspective, the state employs its bureaucratic machinery of specialized and graded hierarchy of officials, rational calculation of means and ends to attain a common good. To Weberian theorists, state power is a neutral force existing outside the social and economic system, which creates a harmonious society by managing competing group demands. A closer reading of Weber's conceptualization of the state suggests that state bureaucratic institutions, including universities, would be staffed by competent individuals whose decisions would be based on a clear understanding of the relationship between the means and ends. Weber expects

bureaucratic institutions to pursue rational goals. The question then becomes whether the increasing use of part-time workers in the academy as well as the trends towards commodification are consistent or inconsistent with Weber's views on the state and, by extension, universities.

The debate about the conceptualization of states notwithstanding, bureaucratic state institutions exist in Canada that make decisions on behalf of the citizens with varying degrees of success and failure. Indeed, the colonial and postcolonial Canadian state has acted on behalf of Canadians at different times and in varying degrees. A detailed account of these presentations is not the focus of this study. However, recent discussions on the nature of the state have demonstrated that the state hardly functions as an autonomous vehicle in the policy making process (see for example, Evans, Rueschemeyer and Skocpol, 1985). Social and political pressures have prevented both the colonial and postcolonial Canadian state from serving as an effective policy making institution. To explore these social and political pressures, Skocpol (1985:7) calls for a "fundamental rethinking of the role of states in relation to economies and societies." Unravelling the role of the state in relation to policy-making amounts to reconceptual-izing the state as a complex institution made up of individuals and interest groups with diverse links to the society.

Non-state institutions, as stated earlier, are generally private and, theoretically speaking, operate independently of the state institutions. They set up their own agenda, and contest or complement the work of state institutions. Invariably, the intensity of their involvement in the policy process (for example, initiation, implementation) would lead to revisions, or curtailment of educational policies. Non-state institutions differ in size

(large, medium and small) and power, and may be involved specifically in educational issues or their activities would have implications for educational policies.

The non-state institutions of critical significance to the study, are the for-profit ones. In the last two decades, many Canadian universities have established Industry Liaison Offices (ILO). The idea is to capture or retain the profits generated by faculty research. Several universities have arrangements with various for-profit organizations; giving them monopoly over service deliveries, especially in the hospitality sector. Coca Cola (a multinational beverage company), for example, has secured the "pouring rights" and is the sole vendor of soft drinks on the campus of the University of Alberta in Edmonton and many other university campuses in Canada. The major contributor to the Telus Centre for Professional Development at the University of Alberta in Edmonton is Telus Communications, a national telephone company with strong roots in the Province of Alberta. On the campuses of many Canadian universities, one can find buildings marked by the logo of major corporate sponsors. These buildings and what goes in them, cannot be assumed to be benign by way of knowledge production and propagation in the academy. Hence, in this day and age, the role of non-state institutions cannot be discounted in any analysis of the educational policies.

As a general term, policy implies state intervention in a specific area of the society. These interventions aim at addressing attainable goals. Educational policies are the types of interventions that directly or indirectly affect education. A direct policy would be reducing funding to the university in order to bring about efficiency. An indirect educational policy would be, for example, changing laws in the labour market that could then have implications for enrolment in universities and colleges. If policy is

conceptualized only in terms of the interventions or actions, the consequences of the absence of policies cannot be accounted for. As Pal (1997:2) argues, non-policy or policy vacuum is itself a policy. Educational and related policies in this study will refer to state policies that affect universities.

Universities have often been conceptualized in normative and value-laden terms. "The university," Zinser and Lewis (1988:217) contend, "preserves and transmits the existing body of human knowledge. It provides a forum for critical analysis of ideas. And it expands the store of human understanding in many forms." The ability of the university to preserve, transmit, criticize, and discover knowledge is dependent upon the free and open flow of information as well as disinterested inquiry. Slaughter and Slaughter (1988:209) also argue that, universities "embody a broad, diverse, and even disparate sets of fields, disciplines, and courses of study that bring together a coterie of people, resources, facilities, and ideas. This fusion of unique capabilities for thought and output give universities a singular position in our society." Implicit in these two definitions is the idea of universities as autonomous institutions engaged in knowledge production and propagation.

Notions about the autonomy of universities have been associated with the nature, origins and purpose of universities. As an institution, the university has a long history. As the Carnegie Council puts it, given that universities are 62 of the 66 Western universities found in 1530 that are still recognizable today, the question is whether it will be "safe to assume that they, like the Catholic Church, will go on forever?" (cited in Clifton, Gregor and Roberts, 1996:3). Even though ideas about human nature have floated around since the beginning of time, the university, emerged in the 1100s and 1200s and, represents an

institutional framework supposed to systematically examine ideas about the nature of human society (Cobban, 1988; Haskins, 1965; Rashdall, 1929). Canadian universities are the public institutions of higher learning that have been mandated by various legal charters to undertake specific tasks. Canadian universities vary in size (large, medium and small) and focus (teaching and research intensive; teaching intensive with some research) (Maclean's Magazine, 2001). The experiences of universities, in terms of the restructuring exercise, are, therefore, bound to vary.

An indispensable resource in any well-run organization is human labour and the conditions under which they work. Universities depend on academic labourers engaged in teaching, research and community activities. Academic labourers in Canadian universities exist in two broad forms. The first group comprises full-time instructors (many of whom have attained tenure position or are on the tenure-stream). The second group is made up of part-time instructors. Three distinct groups of part-timers can be identified (Mullens, 2001:11-12). The first group, normally referred to as "moon-lighters," is usually made up of professionals who already hold full-time jobs elsewhere, but teach on a part-time basis. Members of this group do not have a strong affinity with the academy. The second group comprises soon-to-be or fresh Doctor of Philosophy (PhD) graduates who are teaching for some experience, while looking for something permanent. Some members in this second group are senior level graduate students, the majority of them pursuing doctoral studies and most likely to be at the All But Dissertation (ABD) stage of their program. The third group of part-timers is made up of those who start as new PhDs but eventually do not secure full-time positions and after a while are stuck as sessional instructors. Most part-time positions could be for a term, (that

is four months), two terms (eight months), a full year, or a three-year term (a recurring three-year contract could easily lead to the part-timers in the third group of sessionals). The major distinction between full-time and part-time instructors is the terms of their employment. Full-time instructors enjoy all benefits consistent with their qualifications and the part-timers do not enjoy commensurate benefits. Part-time instructors on a thee-year term contract may enjoy some benefits. However, those employed for less than eight months, their qualifications notwithstanding, do not enjoy any benefits at all. The part-time instructors with PhDs are the principal focus in this study.

The major role of academic labourers, whether full-time or part-time, involves knowledge production and propagation. As far as conceptualization of knowledge is concerned, Karl Mannheim is often credited for establishing the basis for a sociological study of knowledge. The sociological analysis of knowledge involves the "systematic study of knowledge, ideas, or intellectual phenomena in general" (Ritzer, 2000:204). Within the context of higher education, forms of knowledge would manifest in teaching, research and community outreach programs or initiatives. The basic issues in knowledge are the ideas, belief and value systems and how these interact with political, economic and social conditions. Knowledge systems are therefore bound with power and other elements within a specific social context.

The interaction between power and knowledge is the focus of the work of critical pedagogues (see McLaren, 1998; Giroux and McLaren, 1989). Foucault (1982,1980), perhaps, more than anyone else, offers a sophisticated analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge. Interested in the mechanics of power and how it is exercised, Foucault (1982:220) argues that power designates a set of relationships

between social actors, and "what defines a relationship of power is that it is a mode of action which does not act directly and immediately on others. Instead it acts upon their actions...." Foucault's work shows how the subject is drawn into the power nexus through techniques, like surveillance, which aim at creating a disciplined individual. By using surveillance to discipline the individual, there is no need to rely on physical force or violence in the exercise of power. The disciplinary dimension of power is a typical feature of various social institutions, for example, schools, hospitals and prisons, which are organized around forms of knowledge.

Foucault (1980) defines knowledge to include political, economic and social conditions. This is the context in which knowledge or statements are regarded as legitimate or illegitimate. Power and knowledge are connected because "the exercise of power perpetually creates knowledge and, conversely, knowledge constantly induces effects of power" (Foucault, 1980:52). Relations of power can only operate with the production, cumulation and inscription of certain bodies of knowledge as legitimate and others as illegitimate. Similarly, the exercise of power also creates new objects of knowledge. Consequently, the prevailing knowledge in society influences how power is exercised. Foucault's multidimensional, complex and dynamic analysis of power and knowledge, has significance for an understanding of the university's role in the production and propagation of knowledge and the relationship between educators and learners. The role of universities in knowledge production and propagation, especially the role of academic labourers and the implicit power relations, can be seen in the social differentiation and commodification in the academy.

At the heart of commercialization or commodification, used interchangeably in this study, is the attempt to reduce the product of human labour into something that can be sold or bought for profit. In this particular case, the focus is on the sale of the output of academic labourers. In any sale transaction, one is either going to make a profit or loss. In the commodificaiton of higher education, the issue is how certain forms of academic labour are adequately rewarded in the sense that their output can be sold for profit, and how other forms of labour, irrespective of the quality of the output, are underpaid. The latter situation creates a profit as well, not for labour, but for the institution - the university.

Commodification is a key component in capitalist relationships. The writings of Karl Marx and Frederick Engels and the subsequent writers their work inspired, for example, the Neo-Marxists, offer significant insights into the processes whereby labour outcomes become commodified (Marx, 1976; Marx and Engels, 1978; Jameson, 1989; Harvey, 1989). Marx's conception of commodity is rooted in his materialist orientation and the role of labour in that orientation. It is also a critique of notions of the market offered by classical economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo. Briefly stated, market forces, Marx argues, are not abstract relations, but the product of class relations. Marx, within his labour theory of value, draws our attention to two concepts very important to the current study – exchange value (the amount of labour time that goes into the production of a commodity) and use value (objects produced for self use). It is through exchange value that labour would be able to secure other goods and services in the market place.

As specialized personnel, academic instructors rely on exchange value to secure other goods and services. The question is whether the amount of labour time that goes into the production of a commodity for sale would be consistent with the reward value. Since the essence of the Marxian literature is a critique of capitalism, an understanding of commodification in the academy should be within the broader context of capitalism. Any crisis of capitalism would therefore have a ripple effect on and a response from the university (Apple, 1982; Noble, 2001,1977). The driving force or concept organizing commercialization in the academy in this day and age is globalization.

As the concept of the 1990s, globalization, Waters (1995) argues, has become what postmodernism was to the 1980s. In any case, how novel is the concept of globalization? Political, economic and social relations among societies have never been static, more so after the 1750 Industrial Revolution in Western Europe. Adventures by Britain, France and other Western European powers and their merchant firms in the so-called New World (North and South America), Africa and Asia, eventually led to colonial rule and a tenuous relationship between the colonizer and colonized. An important component in the relationship was the role of education (See Altbach, 1995; Said, 1993). The patterns that emerged from the above historical relations were harbingers of what we now call globalization.[3] To that extent, globalization is not a novel concept.

However, the specific and vital element in the globalization of today is the "technological explosion in computerization, telecommunications, and rapid

---

3

In the 1840s, Marx and Engels (1985:83) made references to how the bourgeoisie in

transportation" (Tanzer, 1995:1). Even though globalization, as a concept, defies precise definition, the role of the dramatic improvements in computerization, telecommunication and rapid transportation have featured, and rightly so, in one notable definition. Giddens (1990:64) defines globalization "as the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa" (See also Burbules and Torres, 2000).

The manifestations of globalization include "the spatial reorganization of production, the interpenetration of industries across borders, the spread of financial markets, the diffusion of identical consumer goods to distant countries, massive transfers of population within the South as well as from the South and the East to the West..." (Mittelman, 1997:2; See also Drache and Gertler, 1991). Globalization extends beyond the economic arena. It is also political and cultural in scope. The political dimension is tied to changes in the role of the state and the increasingly powerful position of non-state actors across borders. As Burbules and Torres (2000:14) contend, the political aspects of globalization entail a "certain loss of nation-state sovereignty, or at least the erosion of national autonomy, and, correspondingly, a weakening of the notion of the "citizen" as a unified and unifying concept." The cultural aspect, as Mittelman's definition shows, is expressed in terms of the harmonization of standards and the homogenization of tastes associated with the emergence of a global culture. The assumption here is that the whole world would be exposed to or be consuming one particular or specific cultural goods and

---

"need of constantly expanding market for its products ... over the surface of the globe has [given] through its exploitation of the world market ... a cosmopolitan character to production and consumption in every country."

services.[4]

The significant aspects of globalization for this study include the withdrawal of the state from productive economic activities and the resultant privatization and deregulation of the economic space. The stress on a minimal role of the state is to allow market forces to play a prominent role in the allocation and rewards of goods and services. Governments would therefore restructure their role in crown corporations and considerably scale back their role in providing financial support for public institutions such as universities. Implicit in this argument is the renewed emphasis on private activities, including that of non-state actors or non-governmental institutions, a political and legal regime that will honour the rights of corporations, relative to those of labour. New investment regimes (for example, the North American Free Trade Agreement and World Trade Organization) also encourage high levels of trade flows. The restructuring of state bureaucracy would permit the private sector, under the direction of the market, to run hitherto state functions more successfully because of the assumption that the market would ensure greater efficiency than statist orientations.

While recognizing the vital role of the university in national development, policy makers in Canada have argued that universities, especially in an era of globalization, are not making an important contribution to national development because of systemic inefficiencies associated with their operations. Given that all public institutions in an era of globalization have to be restructured in order to keep the national debt and deficit under control, important steps in keeping the economy competitive, universities have to

---

4
The argument here is similar to those advanced by some analysts in cultural studies. For some insights on the educational aspects of the argument, see Giroux (2001), Grossberg (1997) and Hall (1992).

be restructured, otherwise they might seem as untouchable institutions. Some practical implications of educational policy due to globalization, as far as this study is concerned, include the steady reduction in public funds for universities, the trend towards the commercialization and commodification of knowledge, and the emerging forms of differentiation within the ranks of academic labourers.

C. Theoretical Focus and Significance of Study

The relationship between globalization and education in general and higher education in particular has been the focus of several studies (Burbules and Torres, 2000; White and Hauck, 2000; Press and Washburn, 2000; Currie and Newson, 1998; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997; Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, 2002, 2001; Turk, 2000; Buchbinder and Rajapogal, 1996). These analysts have identified several implications of globalization for educational policy. Slaugther and Leslie (1997), for example, note the profound shifts in the power and profit orientation within institutions of higher learning, in response to and as a product of globalization, leading to what they call "academic capitalism." The hallmarks of academic capitalism include the environment "in which faculty ... expend their human capital stocks increasingly in competitive situations", "university-industry partnerships", "for-profit ventures handled through arm's length corporations [the Industry Liaison Offices]" (Slaugther and Leslie, 1997:9; See also Slaugther and Leslie, 2000). Specific changes of globalization for higher education include difficulties in securing funds for discretionary activities, an increasing reliance on technoscience and those areas of study closely aligned with the market. Others are a tightening of the relationship between corporations and state agencies concerned with research,

development and innovation; and multinationals and their quest to secure global intellectual property rites.

Morrow and Torres (2000:35) also identity the "pressures to develop educational policies that attempt to restructure postsecondary educational systems along entrepreneurial lines in order to provide flexible educational responses to the new model of industrial production." Globalization of education also has the potential to undermine "the capacity of governments to construct educational policies that enhance educational quality or seek to develop some degree of national autonomy in the context of research and development (Morrow and Torres, 2000:43). Slaughter and Leslie (1997:31) also point to the fact that changes under globalization "are putting pressure on national higher education policy makers to change the way tertiary education does business."

Drawing on the emerging theoretical literature on globalization and higher education, several related issues can be identified. These include the role of the state and non-state actions in the production, distribution and consumption of public and private goods and services; the role of labour in the production process; the importance of market and non-market transactions. The theoretical literature on the state, globalization and university restructuring can be divided into two broad categories. On one hand is the literature highlighting the virtues of the market and how market forces can be brought to bear on organizations in order to increase their efficiency. On the other hand are analysts who critique the market-based argument by pointing out inconsistencies within the theory and practice of the market model.

Briefly stated, for analysts highlighting the virtues of the market, universities, as seen by the federal and provincial governments, are not becoming competitive enough in

their search for extra sources of funding. Furthermore, in view of the national debt, governments cannot continue "to pour" money into inefficient organizations. In an age of globalization, governments stress fiscal discipline and a sound financial house. These, according to government officials, are the measures necessary to make an economy competitive and draw in foreign investors. Thus, reduction in funding to universities is to make them efficient, keep down the national debt, and make the national economy competitive.

For analysts critical of the market-based argument, university restructuring is not about efficiency per se. Rather, it is about turning over the public system to the private sector under dubious circumstances. For the critiques, the public good is better served by institutions that do not focus their attention so much on the bottom-line, but offer quality goods and services to the public at large. A sound public infrastructure, the critiques contend, is critical in the creation of vibrant and healthy communities. While the critiques do not ignore the impact of the national debt and issues of economic competitiveness, they maintain that the way to address these issues is not to privatize the public space.

The two perspectives offer valuable insights into the restructuring of universities, but are also limited in several respects. For instance, the market-model analysts tend to reify both the idea and workings of the market and thus fail to account for the fact that market operations are also about power relations. Again, the analysts tend to imply that all state-run or public institutions are doomed to failure, thus giving a version of an Orwellian sing song that "All State Institutions Are Bad and the Market is Good." The critiques of the market model, in focussing on the working of public institutions, have not paid sufficient attention to the impact of the restructuring on existing labour relations, for

example, within universities. The suggestion that public institutions are beyond reproach is also disingenuous. As human organizations, public institutions, like the private ones, have their fair share of problems about how to utilize available resources. In some cases, the assumed life-long career in a public sector can be a reason for complacency.

In spite of differences in interpretation and analysis, the two perspectives share some common assumptions. Both realize the importance of higher education and advocate policies that would enhance its role in national development. The state has also been accorded a *strategic role* in educational policies. For the market-based analysts, the state should leave its historical role in national development and create a framework for private and market-driven processes to take charge of social processes. To the critiques, the state should be strengthened in some areas, especially in how it deals with public services like education, because of the public good. The public good, the critiques contend, cannot be guaranteed by the profit-driven private sector.

However, in both perspectives, state power is taken as a given and not related to non-state institutions or wider political, economic and socio-cultural processes. Educational policies are not the sole preserve of the state. Non-state actors and a range of factors – political, economic and socio-cultural – also impinge on educational policies. The issue is to recognize the state's capability in setting educational policy with reference to non-state actors. Both perspectives have also focused on macro issues within the academy. However, university restructuring has intensified differentiation in the ranks of the academy and introduced new actors in the historical work of universities. The question is how the presence and activities of the new actors (from part-time instructors, Coca-Cola Vending machines to academic Chairs endowed by for-profit organizations)

would affect university teaching, research, community work and overall contribution to society.

The theoretical implications of the above trends for educators (academics), learners (students), knowledge production and propagation, have to be adequately explored if the university is to maintain any legitimate claims to its historical role as a site for disinterested research and integrity. In view of the foregoing, the thesis will argue that while changes in the role of the state and subsequently those of universities are merely turning university teaching and research into just another market operation, there are worrisome implications for educators, learners, knowledge production and propagation in Canada. This study draws on the literature on globalization and the restructuring of higher education, with the aim of delineating these changes and analyzing their implications, mostly at a theoretical level. The over-riding interest is to contribute to, or offer a glimpse into the future contours and role of universities in Canada and, in turn, the fate of humanity in the twenty-first century.

D. Organization of Study and Source of Data

In arguing that the emerging differentiation and commodification in the academy have implications beyond the walls of academia, this thesis is also a study in educational policy analysis. To set the stage for the rest of the study, Chapter Two reviews the theoretical literature on social differentiation and commodification in the academy. The idea is to situate the origins of globalization and its implications for universities within a broader theoretical framework. Chapter Three will discuss, at the theoretical level, the changing role of the state, social differentiation and commodification, and analyze the

implications for knowledge production, propagation, the relationship between educators and learners, and the possibilities of forging critical knowledge communities. Chapter Four, the last chapter, offers a summary of the study. The chapter also outlines some concluding thoughts on the state, social differentiation and commodification in the academy and how these trends can be handled so as to enhance the university's role in the production and propagation of critical ideas about the human condition.

Data for this study were drawn from secondary sources. The use of secondary data is consistent with the study's theoretical focus. Some of the theoretical implications of the restructuring of higher education are yet to be empirically verified and documented in the literature. Thus the study relies on data from campus magazines, discussions and experiences with fellow sessional instructors in colleges and universities, to supplement the secondary literature. The experiences of sessional instructors would be anecdotal in nature. Anecdotal evidence speaks to the particular, and the particular in itself cannot adequately provide a credible basis for generalization. Nevertheless, the theoretical insights that the anecdotes in this study provide could form the basis for empirical analyses. Similarly, the documented evidence, especially the limited statistics on some aspects of the restructuring exercise, cannot in all cases, address the particular. This is because the implications of certain aspects of the restructuring exercise, for example, the demographic profile of differentiated academic labourers, require appropriate historical, cultural, and political contextualization.

With the above caveats in mind, it is also critical to stress that the multi-method approach or use of multi-data sources is becoming commonly accepted in social science research. The approach helps to make the research more rigorous because it provides a

way to check data for plausibility, authenticity, credibility, and relevance (Denzin and Lincoln, 2000). Indeed, as Denzin (1970) outlines in the triangulation method, multiple sources of data have a better chance of addressing the complexities of the social world. In this particular study, the interest is to undertake a theoretical analysis that would be useful in an empirical study of the state, social differentiation and commodification in institutions of higher learning.

E. Conclusion

This chapter has introduced the context to examine university restructuring in Canada. From an historical point of view, the Canadian state has played a pivotal role in the making, implementation and evaluation of educational policies. The private sector has also played, but a minor role in educational policies. Towards the end of the previous century and at the beginning of the current one, it looks as if, the state, symbolizing the public sector, and the private sector have traded places as far as educational policies are concerned.

While the literature on educational policies and the implications for university restructuring are still growing, not much attention has been paid to the dual issues of academic differentiation and commercialization and how these changes are affecting educators, learners and the mission of public universities in Canada. This study contends that it is important to examine how changes in the academy are affecting not only the character of universities but also their role in society. The next chapter examines, in relative detail, the major theoretical arguments informing globalization and the restructuring of universities.

CHAPTER 2

THE STATE, GLOBALIZATION AND THE RESTRUCTURING OF HIGHER EDUCATION: A THEORETICAL REVIEW

A. Introduction

The previous chapter introduced the study and the argument that the restructuring of the state's role in higher education accounts for the subsequent intensification of differentiation and commercialization in the academy. While the changes are turning university teaching, research and community involvement into just another market operation, the previous chapter also maintains that there are worrisome implications for educators, learners, knowledge production and propagation in Canada.

This chapter examines the theoretical literature on the state, globalization and the restructuring of higher education. The chapter calls for the need to situate the state's role in educational policy with reference to non-state actors, especially the status of labour in the academy. The first section of the chapter offers brief historical remarks on the state, differentiation, commercialization and higher education. The second section isolates and examines the context of the theoretical debate between proponents and opponents of an increased role of the market in higher education. The third part of the chapter presents a general critique and an alternative framework in which to examine the state, non-state actors, globalization and the restructuring of higher education.

B. The State, Differentiation, Commercialization and Higher Education: A Brief History

State support for universities evolved with the emergence of the nation-state, thus making them part of the attempts to address the national question (Green, 1997;

Hobsbawm, 1991). The historical antecedents of the national question can be situated in the aftermath of the French Revolution and the consequent forging of the imaginary concept of the nation-state (Breuilly, 1994; Anderson, 1991; Gellner, 1983; Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983). The state, it was clear, had to devise strategies to operationalize the imaginary concept of the nation-state. The operationalization called for, among other things, cultural institutions that would produce and give legitimacy to existing social beliefs, norms, and contribute to social reproduction (Morrow and Torres, 1995).

One aspect of the cultural imperative was to forge a liberal environment for the formulation and discussion of ideas, giving rise to the notion of a liberal state and university or education (Brecher, Fleischmann and Halliday, 1996; Macpherson, 1990). Significant aspects of a liberal state include the idea of a limited government, and using the powers of the state to promote a public good – through the provision of collective goods, for example, education. In order to provide limited government, citizens should possess a modicum of knowledge about their rights and responsibilities among others.

Liberal education should offer learners broad ideas and training that would make citizens, as learners, comfortable with philosophy, the arts, and history with the view of producing comfortable, cultured and informed citizens. In other words, in liberal education, all views are subject to the same critical and vigorous analysis. To undertake these lofty ideals, there was, at least, in the early history of higher education in Canada, a high level of consensus between the government and university officials over the university's role. For starters, in the early days, universities "only educated a small percentage of the population" (Jones, 1998:8). Furthermore, the universities,

> trained the children of the provincial elites, they served as the finishing school for their daughters and prepared their sons for admission to the liberal profession. These

> social functions were understood by governments and university officials; there were no major confrontations over admissions, over the course content or over student discipline because both groups shared the same social values (Neatby, 1987:34).

In training and creating the disciplined and reliable labour force required for industrialization and, ultimately, national development, "[n]ational education was a massive engine of integration, assimilating the local to the national and the particular to the general.... [and] was pressed into service by the state as an essential vehicle of national development" (Green, 1997:134-135). With development as a national goal, universities became major players in ensuring that the logic of the nation-state also became one of national development. It was assumed and, indeed, taken for granted that universities would produce the human capital that would spur on the development effort, in areas such as industrialization and urbanization. The more graduates universities turned out, the better the chances of the nation attaining the goals of development, at least, so it was assumed.

University graduates, with their unique and specialized training, were the vanguards in the modernizing effort of both colonial and post-colonial societies and occupied a strategic space within the nation-state. It is also important to stress that analysts privileged the role of the state in universities because of their expected contribution to national development. The state's role in education was justified with arguments that contended, for instance, that because education was susceptible to the free-rider exploitation, it was important that government intervened to provide subsidies, trained personnel and research facilities. Furthermore, in view of the free-rider factor, the private sector was reluctant to invest in education.

After years of promoting a notable purpose for the state in education, educational theorists and practitioners were confronted with the declining capacity of the state and the consequent declines in university education, from the latter part of the 1970s and early 1980s. The declining capacity of the state raised questions about its interventionist role in development and also set the stage for its common condemnation by many scholars, regardless of their political and ideological persuasions. The unanimity in condemning the state's role in education was unparalleled, and conditioned subsequent discussions on the role of the state within a changing global political and economic environment. As Morrow and Torres (2000:43) argue, the changing global political and economic environment and the policies they engendered "are directly linked to globalization to the extent that all strategies of development are now linked to the imperatives of creating stability for foreign capital."

Similar to the state's role in the academy, social differentiation and commercialization in the academy have their own histories. In the early beginnings of the university, securing a position was dependent on several factors (Rashdall, 1929; Haskins, 1923). Given that the history of universities was also that of breaking free from sacred interpretations of the world, the church tried to control who and what was taught in the universities (Collins, 1994). The few university instructors, as Haskins (1923) reminds us, were required to live up to the expectation of the students, and enrolments were based on the perceived popularity of instructors rather than on their breadth and depth of the knowledge area. With time, university teachers, like many other professional groups, formed guilds that ascertained the depth and breadth of an applicant's knowledge and served as certification boards (Martindale, 1981:28-29).

In the latter part of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, the difficulties Karl Marx, Georg Simmel and Karl Mannheim were faced with to secure and keep full-time academic positions are well known (Ritzer, 2000; Coser, 1977). The difficulties demonstrate the extent to which extraneous variables that go beyond an applicant's knowledge can determine employment in the academy. In the case of Karl Marx, his perceived radicalism was enough to prevent his employment while Georg Simmel, who had reference letters from luminaries like Max Weber, was still not successful in securing a fulltime position early in his academic career. A credible argument often made to explain Simmel's difficulties in securing a fulltime academic position is his Jewish background, which in the Germany of the early twentieth century was, evidently, a liability. Mannheim also experienced dramatic changes in his employment status because of changes in the political environment, first, in his native Hungary and, second, in Germany.[5] The significance of highlighting the historical context of differential access to academic employment is to properly contextualize the academic differentiation of the late twentieth century and beyond.

Public universities, as Turk (2000:3) argues, are in the business of the "unqualified pursuit and public dissemination of knowledge and truth." From this perspective, one can also argue that the knowledge produced by universities, to a large extent, has been used to promote the interests of the powerful in society. Knowledge

---

[5] The attempt to reduce the use of arbitrary factors to dismiss academics led to academic tenure. For some insights on the historical context of academic tenure in Canada, see Horn (1999) and Hardy (1942) for Bertrand Russell's dismissal from Trinity College, Cambridge. However, it is important to note that tenure could protect an academic, once he or she has been hired and has satisfied all the conditions required and necessary to have it conferred on him or her. What the illustrations demonstrate, particularly in the

produced by universities has always been used for or served commercial purposes. However, the current intense nature of commercialization has roots, in the case of the United States, in trends far back to the early part of the 1900s (Veblen, 1918). Veblen's masterful study, *The Higher Learning in America – A Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*, has been taken by various analysts as the watershed in the evolution of corporate interest in the academy (See Aronowitz, 2000). One strand of Veblen's argument is that businesses were dominating the agenda of the university. As such, learners were being trained and not educated. To Veblen, there is a critical difference between universities and vocational institutions. The former is devoted to higher learning through research and disinterested scholarship, while the latter would train people for specialized occupations in the labour. The argument here is that learners from universities are supposed to possess a more rounded and sophisticated view of the world while vocational graduates have a narrow understanding of the world (See Aronowitz, 2000). From the humble beginnings of commercialization in American universities that Veblen (1918) identified, the post-second war period can be taken as the real take-off point for the commercialization of the academy in the United States of America.

The history of commercialization in Canadian universities can also be situated in the post-second world war period (Tudiver, 2000:17-19). After the war, there was an intense pressure from government on universities to generate knowledge that would support the industrialization projects in Canada, and also aid in the reconstruction of Western Europe. The quest for knowledge to be used in the national development effort,

---

case of Karl Marx, is the conditions that affect the chances of your being employed in an academic institution.

by default, make institutions of higher education powerful and commercial sites. Governments invested heavily in institutions of higher learning so as to enable such institutions to contribute to national development. Again, within the Keynesian development paradigm that privileged the state's role in economic development, state investment in higher education and, by extension, national development was taken as the norm (Aronowitz, 2000:19-20). As the previous chapter indicated, the privileged role of the state in financing higher education and an active role in economic development has been questioned from the 1980s onwards. That questioning is the background for arguments by proponents and opponents of market-driven policies. The theoretical roots of these policies are examined in the next two sections.

C. Proponents of Market-Driven Initiatives

Market-driven policy initiatives derive their theoretical arguments from classical and neo-classical economic discussions of comparative advantage and free trade. The theory of comparative advantage, enunciated by Ricardo (1962), calls upon each country to produce some commodities in exchange for commodities from other countries. This theory supposes that some commodities are better produced in some areas. A country, by concentrating on what it produces best, in terms of relative cost, would benefit by importing, at a relatively lower cost, what it cannot produce, by trading with another country. The theory assumes that all countries would benefit, but it does not give any indication as to whether the benefits would be equal. Furthermore, what a country is able to produce, the value of that commodity relative to others in the market, are factors that

would determine the extent to which a country benefits from comparative advantage. Comparative advantage functions in an environment where markets are free.

The free market idea stems from the work of Smith (1776/1976). Likened to an "invisible hand," a free market allocates resources and offers rewards in the most efficient and impersonal manner. It is therefore assumed that the forces of demand and supply are better able to reward goods and services and should remain free from all forms of intervention. The outcome would be competition, which would bring about maximum productivity that is beneficial to the society as a whole. "Economic competition," as Martindale (1981:144) argues, is presented as "the great agency of efficiency in the production of the basic necessities of life."

There are two important contentions underlying the "invisible hand." First, individuals pursuing their self-interests "are better able to produce the good society than governments purporting to act in the public interest" (Marchak, 1991:29). The second contention is about labour and property. Labour, in Smith's argument, is the "source of value in commodities exchanged in the marketplace [and] ...each person owns [his or her] labour and whatever [that] labour produces" (Marchak, 1991:29). Assumptions about labour and its value in an exchange relationship are significant in understanding differentiation and commercialization in Canada's institutions of higher learning (See Chapter 3).

Adam Smith's propositions were further crystallized in the principles of the utilitarian philosophers (of which Adam Smith is a member. Others include John Locke, Herbert Spencer, and Jeremy Bentham). Key aspects of the utilitarian philosophy are individual property rights, minimal role of the state and governments and, of course,

freedom of the market. These principles inform some aspects of the neo-liberal arguments of the 1980s and 1990s. Neo-liberalism, an eclectic mix of ideological positions has conservative and liberal roots, incarnated in the 1980s to what is variously referred to as the New Right (Gibbins and Youngman, 1996; Marchak, 1991).

The New Right presents an odd and often self-contradictory mix of themes and issues that mirror, mainly, its ideological underpinnings. On one hand, it upholds the economic interests of the economic elites, advocating unhindered free market arrangements. Here, the state is supposed to play a minimal role, by reducing social welfare and entitlement programs, freeing corporations (capital) from taxation and regulations by allowing for unfettered market operations. On the other hand, it champions the interests of the weak in society against the forces that it claims would alter their lives, giving the state the role of an enforcer "patrolling the edges of the playing field to make sure it remains level, adjudicating trade infractions and transgressions" (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997:34). The New Right agenda parades itself as a moral force especially in its neoconservative slant where it calls for a "return" to the "basics" and the perceived natural order of social arrangements (Apple, 1996).

The New Right is consequently populist in nature and identifies the enemy as the economic elites, while insisting that moral decadence has resulted from the "liberal elite." According to the New Right, the liberal elite or "intelligentsia" called for legislation to broaden the basis of equality (used the language of rights, and stressed the need that rights should be enjoyed by all citizens irrespective of social class, gender, race and ethnicity); managed to drive religion out of public schools and called for programs to be launched against poverty. The New Right also wants to reduce the power not of big

business, but big government, not the corporate elite, but the liberal elite. Furthermore, the New Right, and of great significance to this study, seeks to "reintegrate education into a national and global economic agenda" (Apple, 2000:58). Herein lies the New Right's obsession with restructuring higher education. Given that the role of the economy is critical in national development, the aim of the New Right is to lay the groundwork for an education which would simply provide the labour requirements of the economy. There is very little concern here for education or what Aronowitz (2000) calls learning, because the emphasis is more on training labour.

The primary concern in this study, however, remains the relationship between the above arguments or principles and educational policy, especially within the context of globalization. There is an inherent individualist or private ethos in the New Right agenda. That position, notwithstanding, Clifton and Rubenstein (2002:4-5), call for a system in which "both teaching and scholarship can be enhanced and rewarded by using performance-based, but collegially grounded, models for compensating departments – rather than individuals – for good teaching and scholarship of their members." The argument is that university teachers, through their autonomy, have also become individualist. In the process, some are more productive both in teaching and research than others and this has created a situation in which some departments, even with stellar scholars, do not reap the benefits of their work because their colleagues within the department might not be pulling their weight

Another element in the New Right argument is the issue of choice. In market relations, consumers are almost always assumed to be correct. Applying the language of choice to university reform is therefore a logical extension of the New Right argument

(Hepburn, 2001; Coulson, 2001, 1999). Choice in the neo-liberal vision in the New Right agenda is closely tied to consumption. Thus, the argument is that there is a world of "consumers out there" who would patronize a wide array of available educational choices. In an environment of choice, parents, educators and learners would be exposed to a variety of choices from which they would make informed decisions. An important point that needs to be stressed is the focus on economic relationships.

Lest it be assumed that market driven educational policies emerged from the economic and political restructuring of the last two decades, Coulson (1999), draws our attention to the historical roots of market education, by providing an international and comparative analysis. Coulson (1999:43) locates the historical origins of "pedagogical freedom and market pressures" in education in Athens, where in-built market choice provisions existed. These provisions, according to Coulson (1999) made it possible for parents to play a decisive role in the selection of pedagogical tools and eventually in the emergence of a higher form of education - secondary schooling. Choice, as Hoxby (2001) also suggests, has a powerful impact on the productivity of schools and, thus, prevents "discrimination against weaker groups" (Coulson, 2001:70).

Based on the above ideas, market advocates contend that the role of universities can be enhanced when their operations are governed and disciplined by market forces. The significance of the market argument to higher education and globalization in Canada, can be analyzed with respect to recent policy changes at the federal and provincial levels and the role of non-governmental organizations (both for-profit and non-profit) in the academy. Federal government initiatives in the 1980s, for example, InnovAction program, are note worthy (Buchbinder and Newson, 1990). In the 1990s, the

establishment of the Canadian Foundation for Innovation, Networks of Centres of Excellence, the Prime Minister's Advisory Council on Science and Technology 2000 Report, and the 21st Century Canada Research Chairs, all point to changes in the federal government-higher education relations (Doherty-Delorme, 2001:122). Provincial governments, in turn, reduced their contribution to post-secondary education throughout the country. Leaders in this regard were the Provinces of Alberta and Ontario (Barneston, 2000; Charlton, 2000; Kiss, 1999; Hashemi, 1999; Marino, 1995).

As far as the role of non-governmental organizations in the market model is concerned, the formation of the Corporate-Higher Education Forum in 1983 is significant. Made up of corporate executives and university presidents, the Forum's major goal is "to optimize the use of Canada's limited human, financial, and physical resources in research and education while tuning the research effort and the university curriculum more closely to the needs of the marketplace" (Maxwell and Currie, 1984:2). In order words, Canada has limited human resources and so the available resources should be used in more direct ways to benefit the economy. Since the marketplace is supposed to be supreme, those limited human resources should also be carefully integrated into market calculations.

Direct alliances between universities and for-profit non-governmental organizations also intensified with universities donning the walls of some of their buildings with the name of the benefactor (for example, Rotman at University of Toronto's Faculty of Management building). Companies in the hospitality industry have also been looking for exclusive deals on university campus, just as many corporate representatives are now on the boards of directors of many Canadian universities and

colleges (Tanguay-Renaud, 2000; Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, 1999). The interaction between industry and academia, it needs to be stressed, is not out of the norm. After all, industry needs to use the knowledge produced by the universities to improve upon their operations and contribute to national development. Universities also have as their main task, the production of knowledge that can be used to promote national development. The problem is the impact of the interaction on claims that institutions of higher education tend to make about disinterested research. Then again, the emerging rules of engagement that industry seems to bring or dictate in its interaction with the academia are also issues of concern.

Nevertheless, the market argument reminds us about questions of efficiency and human rationality; relating these old questions to the work of universities as an organization. As was hinted in the conceptualization of the state, Max Weber expects rational organizations to have a clear relationship between means and end, a specialized and an appropriate reward system and an impartial set of written rules and regulations. Since the focus of this study is on public institutions of higher education, these institutions would be analyzed on Max Weber's bureaucratic principles. The implications of the market argument for higher education, especially social differentiation, commercialization, knowledge production and propagation will be examined shortly. For now, the next section examines the arguments of the opponents of market-driven educational policies.

D. Opponents of Market-Driven Initiatives

The writings of Karl Marx and his colleague, Friedrich Engels, in large measure, influence the arguments of the market opponents. As the previous chapter mentioned, the relevant aspects of Karl Marx's work for the present study, apart from his insightful analysis and critique of capitalism, is his materialist theory of history, specifically, commodity relations and the role of labour in exchange relations. The materialist theory of history calls for an understanding of society and history in terms of production relations. In the preface to *A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy*, Marx (1978:4-5) provides an incisive summary of his theoretical framework that is worth quoting at length:

> In the social production of their life, men [*sic*] enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will, relations of production which correspond to a definite stage of the development of their material productive forces. The sum total of these relations of production constitutes the economic structure of society, the real foundation, on which rise a legal and political superstructure and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness.... With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.

The major issues in the above summary include the nature of the means or forces of production and the social relations of production. Means of production refers to the tools or resources at the disposal of the labourers, and social relations amount to the society within which the forces of production are being utilized as well as the roles assigned to individuals in the production relations (owners or decision-makers and non-owners or labourers). Marx critiqued the writings of David Ricardo and Adam Smith, arguing that their writings glossed over historical conjectures and conceived of capitalism "as a natural and absolutely necessary process which in the past has been hindered by

artificial institutions" (Larrain, 1989:28). In effect, Marx was asserting the impact of broader historical and social forces on economic processes (Morrison, 1998:55).

Marx also acknowledged the significance of Smith's labour theory of value, but notes how "when he was confronted with the problem that there was a difference between the value of a commodity in the market and the value of the labour necessary to produce it as expressed in the wage, he abandoned the labour theory of value and resorted to the idea that the value of the commodity was also created by capital and land" (Larrain, 1989:29). The underlying aspects of Marx's discussions critical to this study are commodification and the role of labour in exchange relations (Marx, 1976; Marx and Engels, 1978, See also Polanyi, 1957, Chapter 6).

At the heart of commodification is the fact that goods and services produced for exchange have a value. Classical economists like Adam Smith and David Ricardo would argue that value is determined by the amount of labour required to produce goods within the context of the abstract market forces (demand and supply) in an invisible process. Marx, however, maintains that the value of goods and services are not solely determined by abstract market forces, but rather by several factors, including the state of technology, the amount of labour power and time necessary or used in the production of a specific good or service. To demonstrate his argument, Marx introduced the two concepts of use and exchange value.

The use value of a commodity is the commodity's value in satisfying human need, while exchange value expresses the value of a commodity in terms of another commodity. Labour thus engages in use value when whatever is produced can be used to satisfy its human needs. The problem, though, is that labour cannot reasonably be

expected to produce, by itself, all that it needs. Hence labour, engages in exchange value, especially, within the context of capitalist relations. Exchange value addresses the question of whether the value labour gets from producing a specific commodity would be sufficient to acquire the value of other goods and services. As a result, exchange value is an important indicator of the extent to which labour power can be reconciled with the value of other commodities.

The vision of society being advocated here and the role of labour in that vision is one of "distributive justice" and an assumption that equality and social justice would help in maintaining worker productivity. These are tenets of socialist ideology (Gibbins and Youngman, 1996). Socialist ideology holds the view that human potential can better be harnessed when individuals work cooperatively for the good of the community and privileges the role of the state in that regard (Gibbins and Youngman, 1996:87). With a focus on community and the state, the emphasis in socialist ideology is on public institutions.

Stemming from the above theoretical propositions, critiques of the market model analyze the conditions of academic labour power, its associated value as well as the emergence of new actors in higher education. The restructuring of the economy in the last two decades was not limited to higher education. As part of the general society, wider system changes have implications for higher education. First, given that the role of labour in other industries have undergone substantial changes, universities, like other industries, have also been "hiring casual labor" (Gamson, 1998:109; See also Tirelli, 1998). These casual labourers are sessional instructors, the focus of this study. Their emergence, it needs to be stressed, is consistent with the post-Fordist feature of having "workers on the

bottom with low status, no benefits, and little job security" (Tirelli, 1998:185). The second factor, indicating wider system changes, is that the distinction between teaching and research intensive institutions seems to be hardening and with that the differences in power and prestige of various institutions as well as the nature of the opportunities that await learners from each institution. Gamson (1998:109) captures the situation as follows:

> The gulf is widening between a small number of affluent and highly selective institutions – where competition for admission is fierce and mostly privileges the wealthy – and hard-pressed public and private institutions. Low-income students are increasingly concentrated in community colleges. This divide mirrors the growing inequality in the society as a whole.

In the New Right perspective, the state is supposed to play a minimal role in education. The emergence of an institutional vacuum is inevitable. Non-governmental organizations have emerged and filled the vacuum. However, being stateless in nature, these non-governmental organizations can

> dominate the global economy, establishing a new international division of labour. In this new division of labour, multinational conglomerates move production facilities to those parts of the world which provide the most profitable combination of capital and labour, disproportionately to the lowest wage states that offer the greatest incentives to multinationals (Slaughter and Leslie, 1997:35-36, see also Chomsky, 1994).

Multinational corporations (MNCs) and their investments, it must be stressed, are sited both at home, distant or far away locations in the world. For many multinational institutions in the knowledge and production business, such investments are closer to their headquarters, the North America sub-continent. In Canada, apart from the Rotman investment at the University of Toronto's School of Management, there are the Munk Centre for International Studies, and the Nortel Institute for Telecommunications. Given

the stateless status of many MNCs, the one mechanism they are using to enhance their operations, especially those in distant locations, is technology.[6]

Noble (2001, 2000) provides an insightful analysis of technology in higher education, leading to what he calls "Digital Diploma Mills." Noble identifies the historical origins of technology in higher education with extension programs in some major American universities (University of Chicago, Columbia University, University of Wisconsin, and University of California at Berkeley). These same institutions and numerous others are currently spearheading the use of technology in the development and delivery of courses. In many cases, the academic labour of choice are the "poorly paid and overworked low status instructors, working on a per-course basis without benefits or job security and under coercion to assign their rights to their course materials to their employer as a condition of employment" (Noble, 2000:120). Winner (2000) shows with amazing wit but with all seriousness, that the arrival of "the automatic professor machine" has significant implications for higher education. The automated professor machine is technically efficient, cuts down on cost and delivers knowledge in the speediest fashion. Winner's analysis implicitly shows the problematic aspects of the notion that technology is the all in all, as far as the restructuring of higher education is concerned, even though it has rejuvenated the research capabilities of universities in the developed North.

6
This is an emerging trend in higher education. A number of questions have to be raised about the trend. For example, what knowledge areas tend to draw in multinational involvement and why? What would be the implications of their involvement in some knowledge areas? How would that affect academic labour in particular and the work of institutions of higher learning in general? Some of these questions or variations are discussed in Chapter 3.

The technological aspects of knowledge production, propagation and issues relating to patents and intellectual property rights are being dealt with by the World Trade Organization (WTO) and its associated rules on General Agreement of Trade and Services (GATS) (Altbach, 2001; Taylor, 1998). In the prevailing global inequality, there are concerns that these new trading arrangements would only intensify the disparities within the global community. As Altbach (2001) argues, the powerful research centres would continue to use that power to generate specific brands of knowledge. Multinational corporations would sponsor the research in universities in the North. Globalization of higher education, and in this particular case, the new international commerce in knowledge would be excessively focused on the bottomline rather than an enquiry to address the needs of humanity per se (see Press and Washburn, 2000). These trends have enormous implications not only for discussions on intellectual property rights, ownership and use of knowledge, but also the nature of knowledge itself and the relationship between educators and learners.

E. Critique and An Alternative Framework

The two broad perspectives offer insights into some aspects of the state's role in the society, market forces in the allocation and reward of goods and services, and forces of production and the restructuring of higher education. The market proponents emphasize, and rightly so, the importance of demand and supply in the distribution and reward of goods and services. In the process, they minimize the role of the state, hence the neo-liberal argument of a minimal state. In invoking the name of Adam Smith to account for the supremacy of the market and a minimal role of the state, market

proponents give us the impression that Adam Smith never thought the state was good for anything. However, that is not the issue. Smith (1776) reserves three duties "of great importance" for the state – one of which is to erect and maintain certain public institutions (See Heilbroner, 1992:53).[7] In their zeal to trumpet the virtues of the market, the proponents scarcely remind their audiences about Adam Smith's nuanced discussion on the role of the state in society.

The major universities in Canada are all public institutions, erected for and funded by the public. Public involvement in education, among other factors, is premised on the free-rider effect, which also suggests that profit conscious private capital would avoid investing in public goods. Indeed, the public good that higher education brings is the compelling reason for public resources to support it. Market proponents do acknowledge the inequality implicit in their argument and tend to recognize the state's ability to bridge or reduce inequality. Yet, they maintain that the state's role in the society, including reducing inequality, should be reduced to the minimum. Put differently, market-proponents, as far as the role of the state and the question of addressing inequality in the society are concerned, cannot eat their cake and have it too.

Market-proponents also give us the idea of a liberal university as an institution that promotes a diversity of views. However, as Parenti (2000) contends, the idea of a liberal university, especially in the United States of America, is a myth. Parenti (2000) identifies several instances where conservative voices silenced faculty members with different views on major social and political issues in the United States. The concern here

---

7
The other duties are protecting society from violence and invasion, and also protecting, as far as it is possible, every member of society from injustice and oppression.

is the presumed "objectivity" and "neutrality" of academy labour. With the emergence of for-profit non-governmental organizations, the conditions of academic labour would be under closer scrutiny, because outspoken political advocacy would become a hindrance for those who do not advocate "the right things" (Parenti, 2000:91). What those "right things" entail are often determined by some of the wealthy private donors and their foundations that often sponsor academic research, and their proclivities are not subject to any democratic discourse.

The problem of wealthy private individuals supporting higher education under the language of liberalism is best illustrated in the case of Central European University (Khmelko, 1996). After the fall of the Berlin Wall in 1989, a number of initiatives were taken to "restore" the health of higher education in Eastern Europe. One notable example remains the Central European University (CEU), in existence since 1991, founded by George Soros, the multi-millionaire currency speculator. The mission statement of CEU is clear, concise and precise – "to demonstrate the falsehood of Communist dogma by fostering alternatives" (Soros, 1994:2). In fostering alternatives, learners are also reminded that "nobody is in possession of the ultimate truth" (Soros, 1994:4) and so, they would undertake a critical analysis of issues in "an open, pluralistic, democratic, market-oriented form of social organization" (Soros, 1994:7).

The irony of reconciling the situation in which the institution is out to demonstrate the falsehood of Communist dogma, foster alternatives in a critical, pluralistic within the context of a market dogma even when nobody is in possession of the ultimate truth, is obvious. Khmelko (1996:98) documents the contradictory forces at play in the education of learners at CEU and notes: "there is no dominant point of view,

since nobody is in possession of any ultimate truth; and yet there is a dominant point of view – anti-Communism." Soros, by virtue of his wealth and support to the institution, also took the liberty to impose his own understanding of what a liberal university should do, and somehow forgot about the inherent contradictions of his position. And since he is the sole financier of the institution, his views would become the legitimate knowledge, structuring the relationship among educators, learners and society at large (See also D'Souza, 1991).

The state of liberal university in Canada has been the focus of several studies (Axelrod, 2002; Emberley, 1997; Polster, 1996; Storm, 1996). Polster (1996:107), for example, shows in relative detail how the Government of Canada, through its Research Chairs and other policy initiatives, is "privatizing only the use and benefits of academic research, while continuing to foot most of the research bill.... [because] this approach ... seems to be more politically expedient, ...less obvious to the Canadian public, and ... less actively and less effectively challenged." The Government of Canada in trying to help private research firms to do research, and encouraging collaboration between academia and industry, uses the language of the market and the need to create a competitive economy environment. These policy statements accommodate some of the inherent contradictions of liberalism, However, a number of questions remain. For instance, with the shortfalls in government funding to higher institutions, why would the government commit public funds to the private sector to conduct what would benefit private research, but use, largely, publicly paid researchers? What would be the impact of the commercialization of discoveries for intellectuals for whom the larger social world is

the laboratory? These questions serve to suggest that the supposed free market or invisible market forces that market-proponents refer to be yet another myth.

The language of quality, contained in the assumption that by reducing public funds to the university, that would make it an efficient organization that produces quality service, is problematic. First, the argument presupposes that universities have had too many resources and in the process have become inefficient. Secondly, there is the implicit assumption that efficiently run organizations require fewer resources. Universities, from this standpoint, can still be centres of excellence, but have to do that with fewer resources. Both assumptions are tenuous at best, because if universities are still expected to be the site for the production and dissemination of critical or useful knowledge, they would need resources to do that. The unstated message to do more with less cannot be attained.

Furthermore, there is another unstated assumption that the market value of a university also reflects the value of its credentials. However, a successful market commodity does not necessarily mean a quality product. To think of the market as the best mechanism to distribute resources and rewards is naïve. There is nothing like a "free-market," market operations are normally determined by the powerful elements in society. In calling for a minimal role of the state in higher education, it stands to reason that other actors would take its place. But then, the objectives of these actors might not, in all cases, be consistent with the public good. Linking university teaching and research to market forces, as the next chapter would show, can minimize the universities' role in nurturing minds that are critical and appreciative of the diverse ways of knowing.

The question of choice and the suggestion from market-advocates that market education would afford a range of choices need to be critically contextualized. It is correct to contend that there are rational individuals "out there" who would therefore be expected to make rational choices. However, the conditions that determine or influence choices are equally significant, because choices are not made in a vacuum. There are structural impediments, some of which are not the making of those affected, but, nevertheless, influence choices they make. In the prevailing environment, market proponents accuse public institutions of higher learning of not offering parents and learners a wide variety of choices, hence the view that private institutions need to compete with the public in order to make the latter accountable. How choice conscious parents and learners would be able to make those choices when conditions of access to higher institutions are not addressed, remains a moot point in the arsenal of the market advocates.

Opponents of market education underscore the fact that the role of for-profit actors in the restructuring of higher education is not and cannot be benign. The major issue here is the locus and usage of power, especially that of the state, more so, in the light of Engels' (1986:210) conceptualization of the state as "an instrument for exploiting wage labour by capital." In relating Engels' argument on the state to the university, a number of theoretical difficulties can be isolated. "Universities," as Chomsky (in White, 2000:443) argues, "are economically parasitic, they don't generate their own resources." This means that who ever funds the work of universities is very likely to influence their work. And certainly there have been instances in the history of universities in Canada

were the state, by virtue of its funding position, sought to influence affairs of the university.

The case in which the Minister of Education in Ontario appointed a professor to the University of Toronto without consulting the University President is a worthy illustration of instances of government control over a government-funded institution (cited in Jones, 1998:7).[8] Despite such occasional intrusions in the work of universities, in the early days of university in Canada, as stated earlier, there was a high level of consensus between government and university officials over the university's role. But perhaps, the argument that needs to be stressed is that governments interfere in the work of universities, not always on behalf of the capital, but in order to satisfy diverse social forces. The power analysis the market opponents offer is limited and unable to capture the nuances of power relations among the state, universities, owners of capital and broader social forces. Opponents of the market have a single focus to the exclusion of the range of social forces that can impact the state and universities in the making of educational policies.

While the market opponents want to protect the public good, what actually represents the public good is, at times, not carefully articulated. In many instances, the case for the public argument is conflated with professional interests. A case in point is the reaction of the Canadian Association of University Teachers (CAUT) to the news that the Government of Alberta has granted DeVry Institute of Technology, a for-profit United

---

8
The context here is the fact that the interests of governments in the university are not always altruistic. The assumption here is that because governments provide funds for the universities, they should influence their activities. Politicians often present such intrusions as in the public interest, while in reality, such intrusions enhance the scope of their political capital.

States of America-based corporation, the right to grant academic degrees in computer information systems, electronics engineering technology and business operations programs (CAUT, 2001b). As the organization representing the interests of university teachers in Canada, CAUT draws our attention to the average tuition at DeVry Calgary ($8,000) and University of Calgary ($4,400) per year, and contends that the higher tuition at DeVry would affect access to higher education.

What the CAUT does not tell us is how that would affect access, because in the buyers' market, consumers are more likely to go for quality with competitive prices of available goods and services. In other words, if the University of Calgary offers a quality program and charges less, it would still be able to draw in a sizeable proportion of learners. Competition in this particular context would benefit learners. However, to better understand the issues at stake, the question is not whether DeVry should be allowed to grant academic degrees or not. The question is this: in what knowledge areas would DeVry grant academic degrees and why?

DeVry is involved in areas where knowledge production and propagation can give rise to tangible policy products and can also be easily commodified. Again, in granting DeVry the right to award degrees, the idea is to ensure that similar areas within universities take notice of their potential competitors, restructure and respond accordingly. By subjecting knowledge areas amenable to tangible policy products to market forces, the inevitable implication is that knowledge areas not seen in that light will be left to rot. This is exemplified by the recommendation of the former Dean of Arts, Ken Norrie, at the University of Alberta, to phase out the Canadian Studies Program

(Tucker, 2001).[9] CAUT can therefore make a general argument about the ability of publicly funded institutions of higher learning to provide a balance of training in physical and social sciences. The association, however, cannot explain why the Dean of Arts at the University of Alberta intends to cancel the Canadian Studies Program at the University or similar actions that are fast becoming the reality of some knowledge areas in Canadian universities.

The above analysis underscores the role of the business elite in influencing and pursuing their agenda. Business leaders in the technology sector seem to be making two important points to government leaders. First, technological advances are key to competitive participation in the new global economy. Second, the demand for technological gadgetry is huge while the supply of labour is limited because the universities, as public monopolies, are not running efficiently. But then it is obvious that for-profit organizations would also want to become monopolies. This argument can be demonstrated with reference to Coca-Cola and the distribution of beverages on the campuses of many Canadian universities. In any case, what do businesses stand to gain from having schools produce their workers ready-made? What would be labourers' behaviour when their prospective employers also happen to be those that give them their certificates? If private institutions secure the right to grant degrees, would that undermine

---

9

The Dean offered several reasons for the recommendation, including consistent but small enrollment numbers, shortage of teachers because of uncommitted and unreliable flow of "soft funds" from year to year, and the difficulty of finding more resources to invest in the program. While making the recommendation, the Dean also acknowledged the role of the instructors and staff of the program for their dedication and commitment, describing their efforts as "superhuman" (cited in Tucker, 2001:1).

or promote relations between capitalists and labourers? Where does the CAUT stand on the privatization debate? While all these questions are important, some remarks will be made only with respect to the last question.

CAUT, like any labour organization, is first of all concerned about the impact of restructuring on its members - university teachers. The organization situates its critique of privatization within the discourse of social democratic principles. These principles advocate, among other things, for distributive justice. In tying higher education to distributive issues, the CAUT is assuming that access to higher education will in the long-term promote equality and social justice. To the CAUT, granted that there is an increase in demand for technology workers, the differences in the tuition for DeVry (a private institution of higher learning) and the University of Calgary (a public institution of higher learning) will undermine access to higher education. This argument as shown earlier needs to be better demonstrated.

CAUT's overall perspective, though, needs to be appreciated. The organization deals with public university teachers and those teachers, by and large, need students in order to maintain their jobs. Any move that would slow down the number of students going into public institutions would therefore raise alarm bells for the CAUT. The organization, it also needs to be stressed, represents a differentiated labour force engaging in academic labour under different conditions. The reference here is to the existence of full-time and part-time teachers and the fact that the former enjoy all kinds of benefits while the latter do not enjoy any benefits, their qualifications notwithstanding. It is becoming increasingly clear that part-time instructors are swelling the ranks of academic labourers as part of the restructuring of higher education (see, for example, Cox (2000)

and Leatherman (2001) on the situation in the United States of America). The increasing numbers of part-time instructors and their conditions of employment form the background for CAUT's involvement in the organization of part-timers at the Wilfred Laurier University in Waterloo (CAUT, 2001c).[10] The organization is therefore planning its activities with reference to the old adage of safety in numbers. At a time when the number of part-time instructors is on the increase, CAUT needs to maintain a certain critical mass that can then be brought to bear on its negotiations with various levels of government and university administrators. CAUT can therefore draw our attention to the public good but cannot give us thorough insights into the nature of its public pronouncements.

Despite differences in analysis, both the proponents and opponents of market education converge on the role of the state, the importance of education to national development. However, as the previous chapter indicated, it is not enough to conceptualize the state as an autonomous agent in the setting of educational policy. The need to rethink the state's role in social policy has been recognized in various settings (Evans, Rueschemeyer and Skocpol, 1985; Migdal, Kohli and Shue, 1994). Unravelling the role of the state in the economy and societies, especially with reference to educational policy, should factor in the role of non-state actors of various forms. An important framework, outlined by Neave and van Vught (1994) with respect to higher education in developing societies, I will argue, has some significance even in the case of Canada, a developed society.

10
Part-time instructors in other universities, for example, the University of British Columbia, Queen's University and the University of Western Ontario have also unionized and have become part of the larger faculty association.

Neave and van Vught (1994:9-11), recognize the implicit power differentials in the state-society nexus in crafting educational policy in their state control and state supervisory models for higher education. The control model revolves around the authority of the state and faculty, especially senior professors. In this model, the state "often uses the higher education system for its professional manpower needs [and thus]... finds its legitimization for the detailed control of the higher education system in the self-proclaimed task to steer the nation's economy" (Neave and van Vught, 1994:10).

The state supervising model, which Neave and van Vught (1994) argue is emerging as the preferred one, is premised on the idea of a weak state, struggling to maintain a balance among social forces in the making of state policies. The notion of weak or reluctant state or more appropriately, the reduced power of the state in an age of globalization needs to be acknowledged. Perhaps it is also crucial to stress that the state, in an age of globalization, may seem "to be losing its power, although, and this is essential, not its influence..."(Castells, 1997:243). In this model, the state sees "as its task to supervise the higher education system, in terms of assuring academic quality and maintaining a certain level of accountability. Government ... respects the autonomy of the higher education institutions and stimulates the self-regulating capabilities of these institutions" (Neave and van Vught, 1994, p.11). In view of the changes that the state's role in higher education has undergone in recent years, the task is to analyze the impact of these policies on higher educational institutions and policies.

Given that educational policies also have cultural implications, two important debates in cultural studies would give a better understanding of the restructuring of higher education. First, Pierre Bourdieu's work on "cultural capital" with reference to his

concept of the field, that is, the system of social positions, structured internally in light of power relations and, second, discussions on network analysis (Bourdieu, 1990, 1984; Bourdieu and Passeron, 1990; Wellman,1983). Cultural capital is the product of the skills acquired through the socialization process, and in this particular case, higher education. What higher education gives to learners, among other things, is the mastery of linguistic codes – style, language and certain cultural dispositions that are consistent with one's area of specialization. These codes constitute the intellectual basis on which knowledge claims can be made and rewards expected. Cultural capital is the backbone for credentialism and the subsequent allocation of prestige, authority and wealth.

With reference to the academy, the logic of stratification and its politics are all premised on certain judgements, perceptions and behaviours that are supposed to be objective and thus neutral in terms of their impact (Turner, 1998:510-516). The theoretical problem that Bourdieu's work raises is whether cultural capital alone is becoming the necessary condition to attain the prestige, authority and wealth of market transactions. The incidence of sessional instructors, with PhDs, highly trained, who have mastered the style and codes of their knowledge areas, being underpaid would suggest that "while it is arguable that going to college is the necessary condition for accumulating cultural capital, it is by no means sufficient" (Aronowitz, 2000:7). What then are the other conditions that would enable one with a given cultural capital to attain the requisite jobs and rewards? This is where network analysis would be of some theoretical significance.

Network analysts maintain that the analysis of social relations should also focus on weak and strong patterns that tie members (individuals and collective) to the society

(Wellman, 1983, Granovetter, 1995, 1983). The reasoning behind the proposition is that individual and collectives "may have differential access to valued resources (wealth, power, information). The result is that structured systems tend to be stratified, with some components dependent on others" (Ritzer, 2000:430). Thus the focus in network analysis is the nature of the entities and social relations, as well as the properties and dynamics that characterize the relations (Turner, 1998:520-521). These entities and relations also represent how actors exchange resources such as prestige for advice, money for services and deference for information in ways that further the goals of individuals. It is from these ties that somebody might "drop a word" in the right place for an acquaintance (Wallace and Wolf, 1999:348). One application of network analysis, as Granovetter (1995) shows, is on how people find jobs. He notes that it is sometimes assumed

> that the advent of "modernization" leads to a widespread use of formal and "universalistic" procedures, liberating individuals from the limitations once imposed by particular social milieus. But empirical sociological studies continually demonstrate the crucial importance of informal interaction in systems that are formally rationalized (Granovetter, 1995:4)

Notwithstanding, the constant reminder that academic hiring is on merit, there are other factors, mostly cultural and subjective, at play. These cultural factors, for example personal recommendation and contact, are often informal but useful, and using them to evaluate a job applicant implies the usage of subjective indicators. Therefore, depending on the cultural practices within the institution, when it comes to hiring, for instance, some of the applicants would be better (more favourably) evaluated in relation to others.

F. Conclusion

This chapter analyzed the theoretical roots of the restructuring of higher education. The ideological roots of both the market and non-market analysts were isolated and a general critique was also offered. The market proponents call for policies liberating institutions, removing the state from the market and creating a competitive environment for institutional transactions so as to attain efficiency. Market forces, it is presumed, would be able to remove the distortions in the allocation of resources. The question, however, is whether minimal state and market reforms per se would shore up the work of universities.

As noted earlier, in tandem with the scaling down of the state's role in education, has emerged a widespread involvement of for-profit organizations. Comprehending the role of for-profit organizations in higher education also calls for an analysis of the relationship among the state, non-state actors, universities, knowledge, and society at large. The broader societal context of the restructuring suggests an understanding of cultural changes. Thus the chapter also identified the importance of cultural capital and networking in determining not only the direction of policies but also policy outcomes. The theoretical implications of the restructuring at the level of the state, academic staff and non-state actors, specifically, for-profit organizations for universities and their role in knowledge production and propagation, educators, learners and the societal are the subject for the next chapter.

CHAPTER 3

THE STATE, SOCIAL DIFFERENTIATION AND COMMERCIALIZATION IN THE ACADEMY: A THEORETICAL ANALYSIS

A. Introduction

The previous chapter examined the theoretical origins of the current restructuring of higher education. The chapter, in discussing the restructuring exercise, also exposed the ideological positions of both the proponents and opponents of market education and offered an alternative framework that would better appreciate the current state of higher education. This chapter undertakes a theoretical analysis of the state, social differentiation and commercialization in the academy.

The chapter has three main sections. Section one will examine the nature of the relationship between the state and higher education. The next section will discuss the implications of social differentiation for the university's teaching, research and community mandates. The final section will focus on the emergence of non-state actors in higher education, isolate and analyze the implications of their commercial activities for public universities in Canada. An underlying theme in each of the three sections will be how the respective changes affect the university's role in the production and propagation of knowledge and attempts at creating critical knowledge communities – a requirement touted as necessary in building and sustaining a vibrant democratic citizenry.

B. The State and Higher Education

According to the neo-liberal argument, the state should play a minimal role in the economy. Governments, the world over, and irrespective of ideological orientation, have

been active in influencing the work of universities. This is because of the importance of higher education to the economy – creating a discipline, skilled and specialized labour force necessary for the country's economic needs, educating people to become good citizens, active and knowledgeable members of the community. Governments, in view of the global depression of the 1980s and the current winds of globalization, have vowed to slay the national debt, create a healthy and competitive economy, and in so doing, have not at all their role in higher education. At the same time, though, policy makers continue to stress the need for universities to produce knowledgeable learners who will help to build and sustain a competitive economic environment. How then can the Canadian government, on one hand, acknowledge the critical role of universities in national and international economy, but on the other hand, adopt policy positions that would affect the university's ability to produce the desired knowledgeable workforce? What kind of work force is being envisaged with the massive restructuring of universities?

To analyze a situation that appears like a contradiction in terms, one needs to bear in mind the ideological nature of the call for a minimal state and the prominent role for market forces in the restructuring of higher education in Canada. As Gibbins and Youngman (1996:5) argue, ideologies are not always consistent in their pronouncements (rhetoric) and their actions (reality). Consequently, it might be useful to analyze the rhetoric and reality of the Canadian government's neo-liberal policies against key aspects of liberal democracy in Canada. The overriding objective in the ensuing analysis is to isolate the policy implications of the state's role in the restructuring of higher education. Before analyzing the policy implications, the next section briefly examines the Canadian state and its role in national educational policies and globalization.

Canada, in the Weberian concept of an ideal-type, is a state-nation (Laxer, 2000). A key aspect of a state-nation is the absence of one sizeable cultural community (for example, nation, race and ethnicity). As in many other state-nations, in Canada, "the state never succeeded in melting [the various cultural communities] into the majority culture" (Laxer, 2000:56). In such states, it behooves the central authority, the Federal Government in the case of Canada, to forge the "imagined community" (Anderson, 1991) of a nation through vibrant public socio-cultural institutions. The dominant role of Canada's public universities and colleges, even though education is under provincial jurisdiction, is a case in point. For Canada, the task of maintaining the state-nation, which by implication, would call for a liberal dose of public largesse, has to be reconciled with the capitalist ethos of the economy and the constitutional fact that education is a provincial or territorial responsibility.

The globalizing imperatives, notwithstanding, the Canadian state remains the site for national educational policies. As Morrow and Torres (2000:27-29) note, the globalization of today "has often glossed over the continuing strategic role of the state in the context of cultural policy....[T]he state has remained key in the articulation of social interests and the representation of groups and classes that benefit or suffer from the processes of modernization and public policy formation." The state and non-state actors, particularly, for-profit non-governmental organizations, continue to organize exchange relations. Similarly, it is the state that interacts with global institutions that organize and discipline the international dimension of national educational policies. Institutions such the World Trade Organization (WTO), the World Bank, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) and regional groups such as the North American Free Trade Agreement reinforce

the activities of states as they seek to consolidate a neo-liberal educational or economic policy. Whatever the future trajectories of globalization and its institutions might be, either at the local, national or international level, the Canadian state at both the federal and regional levels would continue to play the "strategic" role that Morrow and Torres (2000) correctly identified. In other words, the state, representing the respective nations, continues to exist even though the forces of globalization perceive it to be withering away. The presence of the state and, for that matter, the nation, in an age of globalization, is one of the contradictory realities of the current era. Indeed, the emerging reality and patterns engender several questions: Can the Canadian government (federal and provincial or territorial) maintain national educational policies in an era of globalization? Is the idea of national educational policies an anachronism in an era of globalization? What would be the implications of the activities of global institutions for higher educational policies in Canada?[11]

The globalization problematic, in itself, cannot be predetermined in terms of policy outcomes. While common themes or concepts, for example, commodification and privatization, can be identified, their impact on higher education vary from one region to another in Canada. Since the public investment is a major aspect of the funding of higher education in Canada, shortfalls in funding, against the background of regional differences, would simply highlight prevailing inequalities in the country's higher educational system. Education is both a political and cultural process. Any emerging inequalities would simply contribute to tense political encounters between the proponents

---

11
A detailed response to these important questions is beyond the scope of the current study. However, the implications of the activities of global institutions, in broad terms, are indirectly addressed in this chapter.

and opponents of market education (Carnoy, 1998). A survey of Canada's higher educational terrain attests to the uneven nature of political actions, sometimes leading to strike actions in some institutions of higher education in different parts of the country. The recent strike actions at Dalhousie University, Halifax, and York University, Toronto are good illustrations of the argument (CAUT, 2002b, 2000c).

Globalization assumes a homogenous world. The implication here is that politically, governments would play a minimal role in the economy and the economy, global in nature, itself would be under the discipline of market forces. These forces, impartial and invisible, would allocate and reward goods and services in a supposedly impartial and, hence, equitable manner. On the social front, globalization assumes that the variety of cultural practices would either merge into one dominant cultural formation or be overcome by other cultural formations. The end result in either case is the idea of a global, homogenous way of life. Many, if not all, of these assumptions are either unattainable or subject to significant barriers. As we all know, diversity in politics, economic and social arrangements is the reality of social formations, even within nations, let alone among nations. Put differently, prevailing forms of diversity constitute significant barriers for a homogenous world assumed under globalization. The driving force in globalization, however, is the economic factor.

For higher education to be of any service to the economic undertones of globalization, it must devise new ways of learning or generating new and diverse forms of knowledge or knowledge that can speak to the diversity of the social world. The need for diverse ways of knowing partly account for the attempts at many universities and colleges, in Canada and worldwide, by way of curriculum reform with an emphasis on

cross-cultural education, international or global education, long-distance education and the desire to increase the numbers of international students (AUCC, 2001,1998; Tschang and Senta, 2001; Toomey, 2001; Boulding, 1988).

Cross-cultural education is premised on the idea that by providing learners with an understanding of the culture of societies other than their own, they would be better equipped in their appreciation of the world. While this is a laudable objective, the problem has always been studying unfamiliar societies within the framework of the "other" (Spivak, 1994). The "other" is often considered exotic, distant and without any historical or political roots. Consequently the analysis is shallow and makes a minimal impact to undermining stereotypes about the "other" let alone offering a sophisticated understanding of the locatedness and relationship between the "other" and other subjects.

The other dimension of cross-cultural education, international education, is often mired in discussions about the validity of knowledge claims, especially when such claims are supposed to have been made by authoritative figures in the North. In the process, voices from the South are marginalized and delegitimized (Tettey and Puplampu, 2000; Yankah, 1995; Weiler, 1993). The desire to increase the number of international students can be cited as a positive aspect of globalization; in the sense that such students could enhance the diversity of the student population and promote inter-cultural understanding. However, an economic and not a cultural logic informs the recruitment of international students (Caryle, 1999). International students are sought on the rhetoric of diversity. Nevertheless, their economic contribution by way of higher tuition fees (as in the case of the Province of Alberta where international students pay a one hundred per cent fee

differential) is seen as a way to make-up for revenue shortfalls from the state, hence the view that international students are cash cows (Frankman, 2000; Carlyle, 1999).

The common theme in the perils of the cross-cultural education, international education and students, is the issue of knowledge production and propagation (what knowledge is valid, legitimate, how that knowledge is used and why?) (Hayhoe, 1993). The implicit proposition that with globalization of education, national education systems would be a thing of the past, and that knowledge claims would assume a universal and utilitarian status, unfortunately, has not and cannot be substantiated. The global knowledge market is characterized by a hierarchization of knowledge (Tettey and Puplampu, 2000:93-97). The hierarchy determines what forms of knowledge are considered legitimate or illegitimate; a process that mirrors some aspects of historical global inequalities. Hierarchization is more likely to increase with the knowledge producing centres in the North assuming a prominent role, together with various for-profit non-governmental organization, in the generation and utilization of knowledge in an age of globalization (Altbach, 2001). The knowledge produced in institutions of higher learning continues to have the label of a state or nation attached to it, and the possibility that a globalized university would necessarily escape the control of the state or nation is also becoming increasingly remote.

From the ensuing analysis, another critical issue is: assuming the two levels of government are negatively affected in their role of setting up educational policies, how would that square up with liberal democratic values in Canada? Specifically, equity, affordability, quality and accountability (Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, 2002, 2000, 1999). At the heart of equity is the issue of fairness and social justice. In Canada, as in

many other state-nation or multicultural societies, fairness and social justice assume a greater significance because of historical injustices committed against various groups. If education is the mechanism for social mobility, as it is widely touted, then equity considerations should inform the restructuring of higher education.

A useful proxy of equity would be access to higher education. With the declining rate of funding of higher education in Canada, many universities and colleges have increased their tuition rates considerably. Since 1995, with the exception of British Columbia and Québec, and Newfoundland for the 1999-2000 Academic Year, all other jurisdictions have increased tuition for higher education. The context for tuition increases remain the reductions in federal cash transfer payments for education and training, and since many provinces and territories have not increased their funding, the inevitable outcome is increases in tuition. Overall, "university tuition fees have increased by more than 126 per cent since 1990, up to a national average of $3,379 for the 1999-2000 Academic year" (Doherty-Delorme, 1999:107; See also CAUT, 2000).

Given the distinctions made between the so-called "have" regions (Québec, Ontario, Alberta and British Columbia) and "have-not" (Prince Edward Island, Newfoundland and Labrador, Manitoba, Saskatchewan, North-West Territories and Iqualuit) regions and territories, the increases in tuition have produced a patchwork of equity across the country. Doherty-Delorme, Shaker and Gillies (2000:11) in a ranking of ten provinces, and not the institutions of higher education, on the basis of equity, found that British Columbia, a "have-province, ranked first for both 1999 and 2000. Alberta, another "have province" actually fell from third to fourth place for 1999 and 2000 respectively, with Ontario, falling from fourth to sixth. Equally significant in the ranking

of equity is the case of Manitoba, a so-called "have-not province", that improved its position of eighth in 1999 to second in 2000. In a recent study, Doherty-Delorme and Shaker (2002:3) show that British Columbia now ranks third as far as equity is concerned and trace that to recent policy changes enacted by the new Provincial Liberal Government. Their study also shows that a so-called "have-not" province, Nova Scotia now ranks first on the equity chart in Canada.

What these rankings also demonstrate is that the designation of a province as "have" or "have-not" does not play a major role in understanding the province's performance on equity. What seems to be a significant factor in either increasing or decreasing equity is government policy. The governments in Ontario and Alberta, as it is well known, during the 1990s vigorously implemented neo-liberal and fiscally stringent policies with dramatic consequences for higher education. Those policies might partly account for the sixth and seventh places Alberta and Ontario occupy respectively on the equity chart in 2002 (Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, 2002:3).

If access to higher education is not equitable due to, among other things, declining state support and higher tuition, affordability, obviously, will become a major factor in the decision to pursue higher education. Quirke (2000:63) documents how many Canadian families and students, because of increasing cost of higher education, "are feeling the pinch." Drawing on data from the University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Quirke (2000:66) also shows the differential impact of the high cost of university education on the basis of social class, sex and ethnicity; pointing to "a significant decline in the numbers of students from modest backgrounds attending university." Further

implications of the state's role in the restructuring of higher education for quality and accountability are discussed in the next two sections respectively.

C. Part-Time Instructors and the Academy

The common theme in the social differentiation among academic labourers is how market operations generate and consolidate differential levels of power. In the neo-liberal sense, the market is supposed to be the neutral and impartial distributor of rewards. The nature of labour in academic settings demand that the labourers have significant depth and scope of knowledge in their areas of specialization. As rational organization, universities can only hire people with the requisite training and skills and thus would be expected to reward their academic labourers accordingly. However, in the midst of the differentiation spawned by or in response to globalization, even full-time instructors have found themselves being stretched thin with increasing workloads while the availability of resources wane. In their case, nonetheless, there is solid institutional support, even if it is inadequate. The lack of adequate rewards and institutional support are the fundamental problems for part-time instructors.

Focusing on the part-time instructors with PhDs, the argument is that they were hired because of their knowledge in their respective areas of study. It therefore follows that their remuneration would be consistent with their qualifications, at least, that is the theoretical implications of how rational organizations work. Yet, part-time instructors, including those with PhDs, sometimes with two or three years of teaching experience, are not only underpaid, but also do not receive any benefits, especially those employed for less than eight months. Some institutions, in order to undermine any claim to benefits due

to continuous service, hire instructors on a term basis. The practice brings those academic labourers to the "shop-floor" and the level of the classic proletariat.

Reich (1992), writing about the changing nature of the jobs in the area of globalization identified what he called symbolic analysts. These are highly qualified professionals who are capable of engaging in problem-identification and solution and many "have graduated from four-year colleges or universities; many have graduate degrees as well" (Reich, 1992:179). Given their qualifications, part-time instructors can be described as symbolic analysts and, consequently, can be expected to receive income consistent with their qualifications. The fact that they do not suggests two things. First, the failure of the supposed neutral and fair mechanism called the market that allocates rewards on the basis of the value of one's work. Second, the low rewards that part-timers receive indicate the irrational aspects of rational organizations like universities.

As a number of analysts have shown, "there is no such thing as a free market: *all* markets are structured by state action; the only variation is how the terms of their operation are set" (Mackintosh, 1990:50, italics in original). State capability, during globalization, has been reduced. It is thus no longer, relatively, capable of enforcing the terms of market operations. Furthermore, because the state is no longer able to adequately fund universities, these institutions have resorted to underpaying qualified part-time instructors. This practice supports the contention that market operations are not about fair rewards but about power relations and that those with the most power are more likely to, relative to those with the least power, benefit the most.

The trend also shows that universities, as rational organizations, can engage in irrational acts like underpaying qualified teachers even as they continue to employ large

numbers to teach undergraduate courses. Since the data shows that overall between 1992 and 1998 the number of full-time faculty fell by 9.7 per cent in Canada, one can assume that the shortfall has been taken over by part-time instructors (Smallman, 2000:54). Yet, there is no data showing "the proportion of undergraduate teaching ... being performed by contract academic staff..." (Smallman, 2000:54). Data from the United States, however, conclusively shows "colleges' dependence on their part-time instructors" (Cox, 2000:A12). The data also indicates that the humanities have the highest proportion of courses taught by part-time instructors. Anecdotal evidence from Canada also supports the general trend that most part-time instructors are concentrated in arts and humanities programs.

A common feature of some of the arts and humanities classes, especially in the introductory sections, is that there are several sections, and most of them are large, relative to senior level classes, which are generally small. Meanwhile, students, irrespective of class size or the status of the instructor, pay the same rate of tuition. Several theoretical implications are raised if part-time instructors are more likely to teach large introductory classes and full-time instructors handle small senior level classes, yet, students pay the same tuition.

First, the revenue from teaching would be higher in the large undergraduate classes than senior level classes. Since the part-time instructors teach the large classes, an argument can be made that they would raise the most revenue. Second, full-time instructors teach smaller classes, so the revenue they raise from teaching would also be small. Thus, on one hand, the part-time instructors who teach the large classes, generate the most revenue, but are paid the least. On the other hand, the full-time instructors who

teach small class sizes and generate the least revenue are paid the most. In effect, the part-time instructors subsidize the benefits of the full-time instructors. These differentials lend some support to Karl Marx's work on surplus value[12] and the fact that the conditions or terms under which labour is employed, and one can add, irrespective of qualifications, determine the rewards.

Even though the context is different, for the low pay and no benefits part-time instructors receive, their situation is not different from sweatshop workers or workers in an assembly line (Huber, 2000; Scarff, 2000). The prospects of a part-time instructor generating substantial revenue, yet not receiving adequate remuneration raises several questions: what aspect of the teaching would be part-time? Would that be the time it takes to prepare for the class, the grading of assignments or the actual teaching by way of knowledge delivery, responding to questions from students or holding office hours? Answers to these and several questions about the role of part-time instructors involve issues of the quality of their teaching, their relationship with learners as well as the full-time instructors.[13] Implicit in the analysis would also be the place of power, prestige and other cultural processes in the academy.

In spite of the theoretical possibilities of the labour of part-time instructors subsidizing the teaching load of full-time instructors, there are some cheerleaders for part-time instructors. The loudest cheerleaders are administrators (for example, those in

---

12 See Marx (1977) for a detailed discussion of the theory of surplus value.

13 It would be a worthwhile exercise to examine the instructional capabilities between part-time and full-time instructors. I am not aware of studies that have examined that issue, and this study, does not directly address that issue either.

charge of academic affairs in the Dean's Office, Heads of Departments and various Program Coordinators, especially, the Office of Undergraduate Studies), who value part-timers as helping departments meet their budgetary needs. Mullens (2001:11) quotes a former President of both Carleton University, Ottawa, and the University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, who notes how sessionals have "enabled universities to continue to offer places to students during times of restricted funding and kept us accessible …[and that] [m]any of them are excellent teachers." In linking the hiring of part-timers to providing access to students, what the former president conveniently removed from the argument is the fact that access, though a laudable proposition, is meaningless without context. Access should go hand in hand with equity. By hiring instructors for purposes of access and underpaying them, even though they may be excellent teachers, equity is sacrificed and one cannot justify that by saying it enhances access. Meanwhile, as administrators talk of hiring sessional instructors to improve access, even as they underpay them, tuition rates have been on the rise, making affordability, as the previous section demonstrated, an issue as well.

The argument that sessionals might be excellent teachers, needs to be theorized. There are so many variables that determine someone being an excellent teacher and being underpaid would not necessarily be one. However, for sessional instructors, what students say about their teaching, by way of end of term evaluations, could determine whether or not they are offered a job in another year. Consequently, they have to motivate themselves and their students and appear enthusiastic so that they (students) might view their efforts in a positive light. In order to accomplish their goals, get positive evaluations and, hopefully, be offered an employment in another term or academic year, part-timers

would have to have great leadership and communication skills and able to keep their students, and in the parlance of the market – their "customers," happy. However, the theoretical possibility of part-time instructors trying to keep students happy is where the danger of their involvement in the academy can also be located.

As part-timers, teaching is their only evaluative mechanism. Since they are not required, by the terms of their contract, to conduct research or involve themselves in their communities, teaching and teaching alone and, perhaps, their political skills in navigating the hallowed halls of academia, would be the deciding factors in their continued employment. From this perspective, sessionals who want to protect their jobs can easily "buy votes from their customers (learners)" by watering down course requirements and offering other concessions in the hope of keeping their customers happy.

Thus, the relationship between sessional instructors and their students could be an issue. On the first day of class an instructor would hands out a course outline. If the students see the PhD designation at the end of the instructor's name, they might not know whether the instructor is part-time or full-time (especially, if the course outline contains an institutional e-mail address, office and telephone number). However, students through the grapevine would eventually get to know of the status of the instructors, especially when the office of their instructor is a shared space. That realization could engender a different set of relations between the student and the instructor and the need for the instructor to remain vigilant in the classroom environment. The temptation on part-timers to engage in practices that would keep learners happy stems from the contingent nature of their work. It is also due to the lack of, in many cases, "a collective agreement with

strong language on renewal and seniority" and finally, the fact that "administrators can fire any of them simply by not renewing their contract" (Smallman, 2000:54).

When the contract is not renewed, few explanations would be given and in the absence of any meaningful collective agreement, there is no recourse for redress. Indeed, if a sessional were to request from administrators, some of whom are full-time faculty members, the reasons for being fired, he or she may also be accumulating substantial demerit points. These demerit points would feature in any future requests for an academic letter of reference or recommendation pertaining to work history from that department. Job insecurity therefore influences and defines the scope and range of activities a sessional instructor can reasonably engage in, not only in the short term, but also in the long term.

Another group that also benefits from the labour of sessional instructors is the full-time instructors. It is important to understand the context of the argument here. First, full-time instructors, as in any system of inequality, did not go out of their way to create the sessional syndrome, but they, as the analysis will show, benefit from it in various ways. Second, full-time instructors, under the terms of their contract are obliged to conduct and publish their research findings, sometimes in prestigious peer-reviewed academic journals. Third, the institutional demands to publish also depend on the size of the institution. In large or research-intensive institutions, the pressure to publish will be more intense than in small teaching-intensive institutions. The size of the institution therefore plays a major role in the practices of the institution. Consequently, in research-intensive institutions, full-timers will be expected to go looking for research funds, conduct research and publish. These external variables, in turn, are transferred onto the

demands placed on full-time instructors and could well determine the prospects of being granted tenure or promotion. Thus, how systemic power relations intertwine with internal and external institutional values are the key issues to consider in order to understand the nature of the relationship between full-time and part-time instructors. Each kind of instructor is bound in particular ways.

If the institutional demands on research are elevated because the institution is research-intensive, then teaching loads of full-time instructors have to be reduced in order to enable them to pursue their research opportunities. However, since universities are also teaching institutions, the learners would still have to have instructors. This is where the sessional instructors step into the process.[14] While this might be a positive aspect of the sessional issue, a negative implication is the shortage of labourers to handle the myriad of activities full-time instructors are involved in – committee meetings, task-forces among others. Not surprisingly, anecdotal evidence suggest that full-timers have realized increases in their workload, but without commensurate increases in rewards.

Through the different workload of part-time and full-time instructors, the latter are able to pursue their research opportunities. If the full-time instructors are "freed" from their teaching responsibilities because of the sessionals, that would enable them to pursue their research opportunities. They would then "churn out the most and best work ... [and] accumulate personal recognition as the main or only authority in a particular research area" (Tettey and Puplampu, 2000:89). The intensification of research opportunities is also the context within which knowledge production and propagation have become

---

14
As argued earlier, the surplus value generated by the labour of sessional instructors goes to shore-up the remuneration and working conditions of the full-time instructors (even though some full-time instructors also bring in research funds).

commodified.[15] The concept of commodification is not limited to the commercialization of publications but also includes the use of certain types of intellectual output to promote the work of researchers, books and journals within the academy. Commodification ensures that only the work of "recognized academics" gets published. Publishers need such "authoritative voices" within the marketplace in other to appeal to the mass clientele that is needed in order to meet their bottom line.

The interaction between market and academia raises questions about knowledge production and propagation. Answers to these questions also have implications for the relationship between educators and learners. If one, for example, examines Foucualt's analysis of the relationship between power and knowledge, the implications of the relationship between educators and learners are laid bare. Educators would use their knowledge claims to structure a power relationship in which the learners would be disciplined, the market ethos notwithstanding.

In the prevailing relationship between educators and learners, educators are seen as the embodiment of power, and knowledge and learners are expected to imbibe the knowledge and conform to their respective expectations. These expectations will invariably affect the kind of debates that can be waged in the classroom. Foucault's analysis of power and knowledge suggests a new relationship between educators and learners. In a period where the sale of knowledge is predicated on the authoritative voice of researchers, can learners raise any questions that might be seen as undermining the

---

[15] This section draws heavily on Tettey and Puplampu (2000). Even though the context of their work is different, the analysis is, nevertheless, also relevant in the case of Canadian universities.

market value of the researchers' work? The failure or inability of learners to raise critical questions suggest that knowledge would not be interrogated and knowledge that is not interrogated is less likely to be critical, speak to the social situation of learners, let alone empower them.

The foregoing does not suggest that full-time instructors might not want to "buy votes from their customers" or keep their "customers" happy. Theoretically, they do not have to. Full-time instructors do not face the prospect of a job loss if they decide to "raise the bar" in their classes and in the process the "customers" (students) become aggrieved. Lerych (2001:12) states the reason forcefully: "Tenured faculty cannot be fired without amply demonstrated just cause – and, so far at least, upholding academic standards has not been deemed just cause for terminating faculty. With tenure comes academic freedom." Apart from tenure conferring academic freedom, a full-timer who is not an excellent teacher, but an excellent researcher would still be held in high esteem, especially if the faculty secures a sizeable amount of external funding for the institution.

In any case, it is an open secret that research and publication garner the most authority and prestige in the academy, despite declarations that teaching is also important. One can even argue that with part-timers taking on a substantial portion of the teaching, specifically at the undergraduate level, full-timers can now concentrate on research and publication efforts and increase their prestige and authority. It is the narrow and single evaluative criteria for sessional instructors and the absence of any form of institutional support that makes them quite vulnerable to the likely dictates of their "customers" and an underclass in the academy, relative to full-time instructors. Again, it is the single focus

of their work that some administrators cite to justify their low remuneration (See Wee, 2002).

Sections of the full-timers, some of whom are also in administrative positions, perceive the part-timers in various lights (Leatherman, 2001; Cox, 2001; Mullens, 2001; Tirelli, 1998; Shumar, 1997:52). To some, the part-timers are simply going through academic rites of passage and their experiences might help them to secure a full-time job sooner or later. Others believe that the part-timers are not cut for academic life and, as failures, they pretty much are getting what they deserve. Yet, others are sympathetic to the plight of the part-timers, acknowledging the structural inequality, but cannot imagine any reasonable way out, especially, one that would not affect the conditions of their own employment

Full-time instructors, in perceiving the part-time instructors simply as undergoing an academic ritual, often draw on their own experiences in the academy. As Shumar (1997:52) notes, full-time instructors make statements to the effect that "we were once the bottom of the pile too, but you'll finish your degree, get a job and move on". What is missing from such statements is an appreciation of the fact that some of the part-time instructors, have, indeed, completed their degree programs. The statements also suggest that some full-time instructors do not have an adequate understanding of the nature of the academic labour market then and now. Not long ago, an All But Dissertation (ABD) designation could secure one a full-time job in the academy. This route might have offered some older sections of the current group of full-time instructors their entry into the academy. It is also important to acknowledge it is still possible today for some ABD candidates to secure full-time jobs in the academy. Aronowitz (2000:76),

with reference to the United States, however, argues that "it is increasingly rare for a candidate whose advisors are not prominent in their discipline, or at least part of a network of professors in a subfield, to be appointed to a 'good' or even medicore job.... in...major urban or university centers." In the absence of statistical data on part-time instructors in Canada (See Chapter 1), one can only infer that the Canadian situation might not be different from that of the United States. Many graduate programs are structured in such a way that senior students are exposed to the classroom teaching before they complete their program. Therefore, sessional instructors who already have a degree in hand would have undergone their rites of passage towards the terminal stages of the doctoral program.

How part-time instructors could be saving the department, by receiving less, but doing comparable work as full-timers, and yet be seen as a failure, mirrors a certain elitist mentality on the part of some full-time instructors. It also amounts to a blame-the-victim approach. It is correct, academia has the tendency or reputation of being an individualist effort (despite current attempts at encouraging academics to work across their disciplines), hence it is reasonable to expect that any failure would have to be lodged at the footsteps of the individual. However, no one lives on an island. As such, conditions in the larger society would affect the work of an academic either part-time or full-time.

Again, the conditions under which labour is performed are equally significant as the outcomes. Even though, one is employed as a part-timer, it is incumbent to keep track with the developments in their discipline, research and try and publish, but without any institutional support. In cases where access to library, office space and e-mail facilities are offered upon employment, these privileges are cut immediately the term is over

(Smallman, 2000:55). One can, therefore, comprehend the inherent cycle of poverty that is built into the work of the part-timers and the possibilities of being unable to break that cycle. In other words, for some full-time instructors, the fate of sessional instructors should be reduced to an individual problem, because the overall academic system, including full-time instructors, has been, without much fretting, profiting from it.

The analysis so far might suggest that the relations between part-time and full-timer instructors are far from cordial. However, as shown earlier, the two forms of labour are caught up in systemic power and institutional practices, hence the differences in impact as well as the response. There are some full-timers who appreciate the situation of their part-timers, but also, as stated earlier, they cannot think of a situation that would not impact them in a negative way. Tirelli (1998:193-194) argues that it is the insensitivity and, at times, the lack of awareness on the part of some full-time instructors that tends to poison the relationship. Tirelli cites an incident to back up the argument. In one case, part-timers in one department at the City University of New York (CUNY) received a memo written by the full-time instructors requesting that they contribute ten dollars (full-timers were to contribute twenty-five) for a fund of gifts. One part-time instructor sent "a long and nasty letter" which replicated the general attitude among other part-time instructors; they (full-timers) "have some nerve asking for that kind of money" (Tirelli, 1998:193). In some institutions where part-time instructors do not attend departmental meetings and are excluded from the decision making process, it is easy to comprehend how the memo, no matter how well intentioned, might have added to their frustration and anger. One can only hope that in institutions where part-time instructors attend some

departmental meetings, it is not for token involvement but that their role and contributions are taken seriously.

It is equally important to theorize on the demographic (gender, race and ethnicity) profile of sessional instructors, against the background of academic labourers in Canada. Sexism in the general society cannot be expected to avoid the academy because the academy is part of the general society. Thus, in the absence of hard data, it is no wonder that the general impression from the few studies done so far seem to suggest that "being a woman with children" is more likely to confine you to sessional work (Mullens, 2001:12; See also Hannah, Paul, and Vethamany-Globus, 2002). This is especially the case when the woman and the spouse are both in academia and in the same institution

The historical roots of sexism in the academia, while not the focus of this study, were brought to light in the recent settlement by the University of Toronto when four retired female professors sued the university for discrimination on the basis of gender (CAUT, 2002c). In the settlement, the defendants "asked for and received acknowledgement that systematic discrimination took place" and the university, in turn, admitted that it "had failed to achieve fairness in ensuring that all faculty members of similar accomplishment and seniority within the same discipline received similar compensation" (CAUT, 2002c). Even though we do not know how these female professors were hired, what we do know is that they were not sessional instructors. Yet they were systematically underpaid. This suggests why female sessional instructors are more likely to be worse off, because, as Helen Breslauer (cited in CAUT, 2002c) argues,

"statistics show that female academics across Canada have consistently been underpaid."[16]

Gender considerations alone do not define the profile of sessional instructors. The case of Kin-Yip Chun, again at the University of Toronto (Department of Physics - geophysics section), provides an illustrative case of the racial and ethnic profile of sessional instructors (Landsberg, 2000:A2; CAUT, 2000d). Chun joined the geophysics section of the Department of Physics as a research associate in 1985 and over a period of nine years he secured $1.4 million in research grant funding (CAUT, 2000d). Chun's expertise on nuclear test ban verification and earthquake seismology has earned him some reputation among his peers. Yet, according to Chun, his applications for a tenure-track position were always overlooked, while such positions went to "white"[17] males, often in circumstances bypassing the normal procedures for hiring.

Tired and, obviously, frustrated at the continuous rejection of his candidacy, he filed a complain with the Ontario Human Rights Commission in 1992 citing systemic racism in the hiring process as the reason for not getting a favourable response from his applications. The Ontario Human Rights Commission, in its ruling, eight years later, argued there was evidence of an "old boys network" that effectively screened out racial

---

16
The study did not cite any statistics on earning differentials. However, to make the statistics on earning differentials in the academy important to this study, a distinction must be made between part-time and full-time instructors. The absence of data, especially on the former, simply underscores the difficulty of supporting claims such as that by CAUT (2002c).

17
This is a socially constructed concept, often used in the discourse on human classification. As a socially constructed concept, it is often ascribed to people classified as Caucasian in terms of ethnic identity, even though such people are not phenotypically

minorities who applied for tenure-track faculty jobs. Faculty told the Commission that the geophysics section of the Department, was considered a "cohesive, well-knit... congenial, British ... group" (Landsberg, 2000:A2).

The University denied systemic racism in the hiring process, but could not produce documents to back up its claim, because the documents on those "informal" hirings were destroyed. However, as Landsberg (2000) argues, the fact that the Geophysics Division has never hired a minority male or female tenured faculty, the undergraduate population of the whole university being made up of 50 per cent visible minorities, yet less than 9 per cent of the tenured faculty were minorities, suggests that the university has a lot of explaining to do.

To Landsberg (2000:A2), the University's denial is standard, because "[t]hose who support the status quo (having benefited from being part of a privileged majority) always deny the existence of systemic racism, dismiss the significance of these statistics, and scoff at the importance, to marginalized groups, of seeing other minority people win advancement." Beyond the report of the Ontario Human Rights Commission, the Canadian Association of University Teachers stepped into the case, and a resolution was finally reached in October 2000 (CAUT, 2000d).

The Chun case has several implications. Academic hiring is, at times, often mysterious, secretive and looks like the last frontier in cronyism. In that scenario, meritocracy seems to be replaced by social capital, the breadth, depth and strength of one's network. Another implication is the idea that Chun's case might be reflecting a general but reluctant admission in Canada that the academy, all other things being equal,

---

white as snow. For some insights into the social construction of race, see Puplampu and Codjoe (2001:83-89).

a good job, is mainly "white" (Flecker, 2000) while the broader society keeps on reciting feel good multi-racial and multi-ethnic (cultural) slogans. However, Chun's particular case should not be used as a basis for a general statement about the employment chances of the visible minorities, either as part-time or full-time academic labourers in Canada.

Guppy and Davies (1998:41), using data from the 1991 Census show that "visible minorities were under-represented in the teaching force" as a whole (Table 2.4). However, the authors also found out that visible minorities were over-represented in some areas of the force, for example, full-time university teachers. Given the range of visible minority groups in Canada, it is not surprising that Guppy and Davis (1998:42) observed significant variations in representation (under or over) across the various groups. However, more revealing from their study is the concession that the "social forces underlying these patterns are difficult to explain, and the data do not permit [them] to judge whether the patterns are caused by discrimination, recency of immigration and other supply-side factors among minorities" (Guppy and Davis, 1998:42).

If the above concession is placed in a historical context, it would negate any social progress that visible minorities are supposed to have made by being over-represented in the occupation of university teachers. Put differently, the over-representation of visible minorities as university teachers neither addresses the historical barriers visible minorities or minority groups are faced with, and nor is it an indication that such barriers are no longer part of the covert structures in the academy. For example, in the absence of data on hiring procedures (for example, the pool of candidates who applied for the job across the lines of race and ethnic, and minutes from the hiring committees), as well as the number of part-time instructors in Canada (See Chapter 1), it

is difficult to construct a reliable and valid profile of sessional instructors in Canada on the basis of race and ethnicity.

Gender, race and ethnicity are not the only variables at play in some academic hiring practices. Another variable is the politics of the candidate, as reflected in published work. A notable illustration is the case between David Noble and Simon Fraser University over his appointment to the James S. Woodsworth Chair in Humanities. Noble, an academic with the credentials and work to show was recommended by the hiring committee to hold the Chair, but the University administration rejected the Hiring Committee's recommendation.[18] The other factor that affected Noble's hiring, it seems was his politics. Having written extensively on the commercialization of the academy and been outspoken in his views, the University authorities might have forgotten about

---

18

Even though it is important to explore why Noble, the candidate recommended, was not offered the job, it is equally significant to explore the politics of James Woodsworth – whose Chair Noble was supposed to occupy. The Woodsworth Chair, one of nine endowed chairs at Simon Fraser University, was established in honour of James S. Woodsworth — a clergyman, social reformer, member of parliament, and founder of the Cooperative Commonwealth Federation (CCF). The holder of the chair is to be an outstanding scholar and a person who engages in outreach to the community on issues of social justice and peace, apparently those were some of the many activities Woodsworth engaged in during his life time. At the beginning of the 20th century, here is what Woodsworth had to say about Africans, who, like all others, were migrating to *his* Canada: The "very qualities of intelligence and manliness which are the essentials for citizens in a democracy were systematically expunged from the negro race…[and thus] [h]ardly a desirable settler" (cited in Tettey, 2001:163). These could hardly be the words of someone who works for social justice and peace. In presenting only one aspect of Woodsworth's work, learners and the society are misinformed and miseducated. The need to acknowledge the totality of the personalities discussed in a classroom setting is critical if learners are expected to have a holistic framework on and about political, economic and social issues. Omissions or absences in the literature about some personalities, regrettably, are common in academia. There is the case of John M. MacEachran, a University of Alberta Professor and his role as Chair of the Alberta Government Sterilization Board from 1929-1965. For some insights on this case, see Wahlsten (1998; 1997).

academic freedom and integrity and perceived Noble as a loose cannon – which, they might have reasoned would not bode well for *their* university. If Noble, a solid intellectual, could be treated in this manner, then one can only begin to appreciate the kind of environment within which sessional instructors have to work and the range of factors that would structure their work.

In a revealing and an insightful essay, Miller (2001), analyzing his supposed "meritocratic rise" in the academy, documents how his connections (social capital and networking) opened several job opportunities for him in his career. Qualified though he was to secure the job, however, he indicates that in most cases, there was no point of comparison or competition because the job was not advertised, and so there was no one to compete against. In essence, no other search was conducted and his powerful insiders simply handed the job over to him. Miller (2001) also notes that "it is not easy to build and maintain procedures that are truly meritocratic," arguing further that "[e]ven the simple open posting (what currently is termed "transparency") of job openings is easily subverted." Because some years ago, he "checked on the listing of a sociological position which asked for a most unusual combination of experience and interests. [He] learned that the job description was written to fit the individual whom the department wanted to hire". Based on the experiences and analysis, Miller poses a critical question: "If decisions [for example, academic hiring] will always come in part through social capital and networks, how do we ensure that the poor, the minority, the disadvantaged, get into the loop of the privileged?" (Miller, 2001). This question, if adequately analyzed in an empirical setting, could well offer us some insights into the future profile of sessional instructors in Canada.

The foregoing implies there are numerous challenges academic labourers have to overcome first to enter the academy and then to produce and propagate knowledge. It is a process that, if not carefully managed, might not produce the desired results for learners and the citizenry at large. In other words, the supposed common interest between educators and learners as active agents interacting to create new ways of knowing cannot be realized. The interaction will be muzzled by the market potential of the knowledge produced by the educators (read as researchers). The interaction and its outcomes assume greater significance with the emergence of non-state actors in the academy.

D. Non-State Actors and the Academy

Non-state actors have been involved in the activities of the academy since universities emerged as medieval learning institution. The historical involvement of non-state actors, notwithstanding, universities, over the years, have been perceived as autonomous and disinterested producers and propagators of "objective" knowledge (Turk, 2000;White and Hauck, 2000; Slaughter and Leslie, 1997). Thus, the role of non-state actors in the academy is not new. What is new, and perhaps unprecedented, is the scope and intensity of their involvement, more so, with changes in the role of the state. The range of non-state actors in the academy is as varied as the issues that they stand for or bring to bear on the academy. A useful categorization is to consider some as non-profit and others as for-profit. A major feature of the activities of the former is the traditional view of performing a social good, while the latter aims to make profit. The latter is the subject of the subsequent discussion.

Two high profile cases involving for-profit actors in the academy are the David Healy and Nancy Olivieri episodes, at the University of Toronto, in Toronto (CAUT, 2002; Thompson, Baird and Downie, 2001; Olivieri, 2000). David Healy's contract as the Clinical Director of the Mood and Anxiety Program with the Centre of Addiction and Mental Health and as Professor of Psychiatry, was cancelled after he gave a lecture critical of the role of pharmaceutical companies in university research. After the contract was cancelled, Healy launched a lawsuit against the University and the case was settled out of court.

In the statement, the University said the settlement "underscores its support for free expression of critical views and acknowledges Healy's scholarship by confirming that it will be appointing him as a Visiting Professor in the Faculty of Medicine" (cited in CAUT, 2002a). The specific pharmaceutical companies Healy might have mentioned in his lecture were not disclosed. However, pharmaceutical companies are not charitable organizations, and since they provide funds for university research, they might have reasoned that their profits would be affected if Healy became a Clinical Director of the Institute. Given that universities are looking for research funds, it is also reasonable to expect that whoever pays them could as well call the tune. The University of Toronto, confronted with the prospects of monetary rewards and the values that universities purport to stand for, chose the prospects of monetary rewards. The eventual settlement of the case, according to the CAUT (2002a), is a clear "vindication" of the quality and integrity of Healy's scholarship. However, one is also left wondering if the University's change of heart was genuine or a ploy to deflect the mounting public criticism of its handling of the hiring fiasco, which in the long run might also tarnish the reputation of

the University in the global intellectual community. More importantly, this episode does not support the "neutral" and "objective" knowledge claims often ascribed to and made by institutions of higher education.

The case of Nancy Olivieri and Apotex Inc., a Canadian pharmaceutical company, also speaks volumes about the implications of the role of for-profit organizations in university research and teaching. Olivieri, a clinician at the University of Toronto and Principal Investigator of a study at the Hospital for Sick Children, was involved in a study partly funded by Apotex. After discovering the dangerous side effects of the drug under study, deferiprone, Apotex removed her from the study and threatened legal action if she informed her patients and, indeed, the scientific and general communities about her negative findings. For Apotex, the need to conceal information is to ensure that, as the proprietors of rights to the deferiprone, they reap the expected profit, once the drug is commercialized, even if the drug has harmful side effects.

However, it is also important to contextualize Apotex's insistence that the negative information be sealed. That demand was consistent with the confidential clause in the legal contract Olivieri signed with the company. As Olivieri (2000:53) notes herself, the confidentiality clause of the contract, later deemed to be illegal under Canadian law,[19] was intended to prevent the disclosure of "scientific findings without permission of the company."

19

According to Dan Soberman, former Dean of Law at Queen's University in Kingston, Ontario, "Under common law, any contractural clause is void to the extent that it offends public policy. Accordingly, to the extent such a clause prohibits disclosure of information about a medicine that might reasonably be believed by a researcher to cause harm to the health of a person taking that medicine, the clause is void (cited in Olivieri, 2000:56).

Putting the legal niceties aside, it is the response or lack of response of the University of Toronto to one of its faculty members locked in a battle with a for-profit organization that deserves closer scrutiny. Accounts by both Olivieri (2000) and Thompson, Baird and Downie (2001), an independent committee struck by the CAUT to investigate the episode, demonstrate the action or inaction by the University of Toronto and its medical hospital, Toronto's Hospital for Sick Children, in the Olivieri-Apotex saga (See also Nathan and Weatherall, 1999). There were marked similarities in the responses by senior management in both institutions.

The University and its Hospital both sided with Apotex, in effect, disagreed with the steps taken by their employee. Indeed, the then President of the University, Robert Prichard, actually became a lobbyist for drug companies. Robert Prichard, wrote a letter to Jean Chrétien, the Prime Minister of Canada, "urging the government to relax its restrictions on generic drug firms" (Olivieri, 2000:55). When the University President's letter to the government on behalf of drug companies was leaked, the President, evidently embarrassed, issued an apology. The context of the University President's actions is of particular interest.

At the time when the University administration was involvement in the case, Apotex was said to be negotiating a $25 million donation to the University. Apotex later reduced the promised donation to a mere $5 million, citing declining profits (Olivieri, 2000:55). It is not surprising that Apotex reduced the donation because of declining profits, since a faculty of the university "undermined" a research project that would have eventually increased the profit of the company. Did the prospects of the donation cloud the judgements of University and Hospital Officials? In broad terms, could monetary

rewards compel institutions of higher learning to muddy the nature of the relations between research ethics and academic freedom? What lessons can be learned from this case to guide future academia-industry relations? These questions would be addressed in a latter section of this chapter. The two cases above received a fair amount of media attention, particularly the Olivieri-Apotex duel. However, there are several less publicized cases of the interaction between for-profit institutions and the academy.

The name of a corporate, family or an individual donor now dons some buildings on the campuses of major Canadian universities and colleges. Sizeable proportions of private sector contribution to higher education are in business-related subject areas. There is the Rotman Building (Faculty of Management) at the University of Toronto, the Schulich School of Business at York University, Toronto, the Richard Ivey School of Business at the University of Western Ontario, London. Others are the Haskayne School of Business at the University of Calgary and the Telus Centre at the University of Alberta, Edmonton. Where there are no specific corporate contributors, the program is tailored on a corporate model, for example, the website of Queen's Executive Master of Business Administration Program, proudly displays the list of its corporate partners and has in place mechanisms "to educate students accordingly" (Doherty-Delo ne and Shaker, 2000:93). The program, though expensive, according to Ken Wong, an official with the program, the students perceive it "as an investment, not an expense" (cited in Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, 1999:5). Is education in general not an investment?

For major Faculties of Businesses that do not have a notable private or corporate sponsor, their activities are still guided by economic calculations. For example, the Faculty of Business at the University of Alberta recently changed its name to School of

Business. According to Rod Ziegler, the School's Director of Communications, the name change "is intended as an *economic* move towards efficient means while directing more funding towards critical areas such as technological upgrading, as well as resources for professors and students" (cited in Chan and Fung, 2000:1, italics added). The name change, as the Director of Communications, further noted, is essentially for marketing purposes. Indeed, the name was changed even though by the University's definition, "school has a lower standing than a faculty" (Chan and Fung, 2000:1). This is yet another illustration of the fact that in this day and age, the economic factor is so powerful to the extent that it can outweigh academic considerations.

The Telus Centre, for example, is the brainchild of the Telus Communication, an information and communication giant in Canada. Perhaps, since this Centre is closer to home, a further analysis is in order. But first, a brief background on the Centre. Delivering the keynote address at the University of Alberta's Institute of Professional Development in September 1998, Doug Owram, Provost and Vice-President for Academic Affairs, University of Alberta in Edmonton, posed a critical question. If the close links between the corporate sector and the university "has created controversy within the academy and will undoubtedly create more in the future" why should the University of Alberta "take this road at all?" (Owram, 1998:5). According to Owram, the traditional model of education in which few and young Canadians registered at the nearest university to pursue higher education is no longer tenable. This is because of increases in demand for post-secondary education, technological advances and the desire by many self-motivated and professional individuals for "education of a high level" (Owram, 1998:5).

Given these trends, according to Owram, Canadian universities in the near future would become like the American ones where the name of the institution reflects the market value of one's credentials. "If this is the case," Owram maintains, "the University of Alberta wants to make sure it sits in the first tier" of a handful of Canadian universities that will capitalize on that outcome (Owram,1998:5). Owram concluded his address by invoking the work of Henry M. Tory, the University's first President, and his faculty members who "regularly toured the province [of Alberta] to bring the university to the broad community and to meet the needs that could not be handled in the traditional manner." Therefore, Owram (1998:5) claims that "What we are attempting to build [Institute of Professional Development] today follows that tradition." Later in 1998, the Institute of Professional Development merged with initiatives from Telus Communications. The result is the Telus Centre sited on the campus of the University of Alberta, the only building on the campus named after a company. Telus' contribution of $12.9 million to the cost of constructing the building and another $3.5 million to an underground parking lot was the largest business contribution to the University of Alberta (Parmar, 2002:2; New Trail, 1998:37).

Owram's speech offers significant insights into the mentality of university administrators, many of whom, in anticipation of a brave new world for higher education, are trying to position their institutions to reap adequate rewards from the market. To better understand Owram's speech, it is important to identify some current trends at the University from the perspective of two critical constituents of the university - the faculty and students. While the university is seeking out and concretizing initiatives with various corporations, the resources that will sustain the university's quality of education are on

the decline. As Rubinstein (1999a:3) reports, at a University ceremony to honour teaching and learning, one honouree, mathematical sciences professor, Andy Liu complained in a hand written note to Roderick Fraser, the President of the University, about cutbacks in the library's subscription to key journals in mathematical sciences.

Picking up on the same issue, Smith (1999:6) in an editorial in the *Gateway*, the University's Student Magazine, wondered why "at the U of A [University of Alberta], where people are supposed to be smart," priorities have skewed to the extent of cutting back on academic journals that will enhance the work of both faculty and students. Smith offers an insightful commentary on a statement by Glenn Harris, Vice-President, Finance and Administration, that the university experiences great difficulties raising money for the library because the library does not lend itself to what donors call "specific purposes." Smith argues that Telus, the company involved in the Institute of Professional Development, apparently, would not want to have its name under a tiny academic journal saying - "This journal is brought to you by Telus." Rather, it would rather want to put its name on a huge building that is visible and this, according to the logic of the argument, makes its contribution to the university "specific."

The Telus Centre or the Institute for Professional Development, opened for business in September 2000, with the mandate to provide continuous education for professionals by developing courses to individuals and organizations interested in enhancing the knowledge of their workforce. Since the Institute is supposed to be self-financed and competitively priced, its clientele is more likely to come from the business community, who, unlike arts and humanities-related disciplines, would have the ability to pay. The Centre for Professional development, drawing its academic labourers from the

Faculty of Extension and the School of Business, run into serious financial difficulties and the program was shut down in February 2002 (Parmar, 2002:1-2).

Doug Owram, the Provost and Vice-President Academic at the University of Alberta, lamented that over the two year period with "more than $800,000 ...in operational costs... the university can no longer afford to maintain such a program in its current state" (Parmar, 2002:1). The obvious question is how the $800,000 operational cost was incurred and how it would be paid. The Centre is now to be opened to students, and there are plans to schedule some classes in it. The possibility of having classes in the Telus Centre worries Chris Samuel, the then President of the Students' Union. The former President fears that students might be compelled to pay for the cost of the losses incurred so far as well as future maintenance of the facility through tuition increases (Parmar, 2002:2).

The knowledge areas that attract private sector involvement are quite significant. From the few examples above, it is clear that private sector involvement is closely tied to business areas, because the underlying philosophy of the involvement is to enhance the profit margin of businesses. The philosophy, by itself, can be justified, given the importance of the economy to societal development. However, the single focus on business related areas of knowledge production gives the impressions that other areas, especially the social sciences are not important to the economy and hence there is no need to support them. That postulation cannot be sustained, because the social sciences, with a focus on the social – the human aspects of society - have a lot to offer towards our understanding of human complexities.

Besides the business related disciplines, there are some involvement in social science areas: the Peter Munck Centre for International Studies at the University of Toronto, the Lui Centre for the Study of Global Issues and the Peter Wall Institute for Advanced Studies both at the University of British Columbia, Vancouver. The few areas in the social sciences that receive support also tend to be tied to knowledge production activities that would pave the way for business activities abroad. It is fair to argue that the few social sciences areas that receive some private support, often under global or international studies, are targeted to areas where leading corporations have investments. Consequently, it looks more like gaining knowledge from selected areas of the world which also happen to be the sites of major companies, than any concerted effort to generate knowledge of relevance to those communities.

It is, however, becoming increasingly clear that given the complexities of the world, a strong grounding in the social sciences is required to appreciate the social context of technological innovations. It might therefore have appeared odd to Federal officials, when 30 high-tech Chief Executive Officers (CEOs) petitioned the Federal government to support liberal arts education (Norrie, 2000:A23).[20] According to the CEOs, the complexities of the world demand "creative thinkers at all levels of the enterprise who are comfortable dealing with decisions in the bigger context. They must be able to communicate - to reason, create, write and speak - for shared purposes: hiring, training, managing, marketing and policy-making" (cited in Norrie, 2000:A23).

---

[20] Ken Norrie, is an economist and former Dean of the Faculty of Arts at the University of Alberta. Although his information might appear as self-serving, the argument nevertheless can be made about the increasing recognition of the value of a liberal arts education in an increasingly complex world.

To be sure, employers often argue, justifiably or unjustifiably, that they cannot perceive the relevance of social science training to industry. That perception accounts for the increased emphasis on, and the commercialization of business-related areas of study. Students, on the other hand, have become concerned about their education and labour market trends. Students' interest in what their education can buy them in the marketplace is particularly important in light of the increasing cost of higher education in Canada. The view by prospective employers and students' own understanding of the labour market trends have given rise to a certain apprehension about education and employment possibilities, especially for arts students; the argument by the CEOs cited above notwithstanding.

Liberal education has come to be seen as useless and without value. Diane Francis, writing in the Financial Post, notes the failure of Canadian universities and provinces "to provide the right educational curricula... [and] encouraging people to learn *useless information in fields without any economic upside*" (cited in Dorrance,1999:6, italics added). This perception has informed government demands that universities restructure academic programs, promote certain areas and scale down other areas. These perceptions and consequent policy measures have been in vogue even though the reality is another story altogether.

Allen (1998) examines the statistical evidence for the employability of university graduates in the humanities, social sciences and education. From the research, Allen (1998:20 Table 9) found that in 1995, the unemployment rate among university humanities, arts and education graduates in the age group 25-29 was significantly lower (6 per cent) than that among graduates of technical, vocational or career programs of the

same age (10 per cent). The unemployment rates for engineering and mathematics and physical sciences were 5 and 6 per cent respectively. The study also showed the social rate of return to society on an investment in social sciences was 9 per cent, education was 10.2 per cent and the humanities was 7.8 per cent (Allen, 1998:22, Table 13). These percentages as Allen (1998) further demonstrates, compare very favourably with the 7.9 per cent for engineering and 7.4 per cent for mathematics and the physical sciences.

Analysts have also argued that the importance of a liberal arts education involve less tangible but more fundamental values (Axelrod, 2002, 1998; Dorrance, 1999; Legget, 1999). According to Christine Overall, "if it matters what kind of persons we are and what kind of persons we want to become, then a liberal arts education is irreplaceable" (cited in Dorrance, 1999:6). Some of the irreplaceable aspects of liberal education include, respect for human diversity, an appreciation for one's and other cultures, an understanding of the workings of political systems, their strengths and weaknesses both at home and abroad, an ability to think clearly and carefully (Dorrance, 1999:6).

What these statistics and analysis indicate is that an investment in the social sciences, arts and humanities does not sentence learners to unemployment and that these areas of study also contribute to the overall well-being of society. The perception that the social sciences are useless and uneconomic has, therefore, no basis in facts. One can only hope that industry incursions into the academy would take cognizance of the facts about the value of the social sciences.

It is also important to note that in some cases, academics go to industry, by way of Industry Liaison Offices (ILO). The idea is to capture or retain the profits that will be

generated by faculty research leading to shifts in faculty sources of research funding and priorities (Dorrance, 2000:13-16). Faculty, especially, in the life sciences are likely to be under considerable pressure to produce knowledge that can be patented through the on-folding regime on intellectual property rights (CAUT, 2002d). The key issue here is the profitability of knowledge. Not surprisingly, spin-off companies, especially in the life sciences, are now a common feature on the campuses of research-intensive universities. At the University of Alberta, for example, sixty-five percent of all the spin-off companies originate in the life sciences (Tyrrell, 2002:2). Vallance (2001:1805) identifies two forms of such spin-off companies – those "that develop from the university, and … [those] that remain embedded within academia."

Either way, there are some practical tensions or difficulties in academia-industry relations. These include disclosure of research findings, ownership of the findings, within the context of patents and intellectual property rights. Others are the public-cum-private cost and benefits in the production and propagation of research findings and the implications for educators, learners and the broader society (Vallance, 2001; DiCenzo, 2001; White, 2000; Press and Washburn, 2000). A hallmark of the academic enterprise is not only the generation of knowledge, but the free flow and dissemination of the knowledge. The knowledge that is generated, in some cases, goes against the grain and sets up the basis for new ways of knowing. New ways of knowing, by definition, would affect the power and privilege of the adherents of previous ways of knowing. The problem of academia-industry relations is whether research findings that are negative to the interests of industry would be disclosed as soon as they are discovered, since such findings could well initiate the downfall of a company. If negative findings are not

disclosed in a timely manner, so as to maintain the industry's profitability, would the general public then be exposed to an unacceptable risk? The Olivieri-Apotex debacle, in a way, provides some insights into the theoretical possibility of delaying research findings in order to enhance the profitability of a company.

Vallance (2001) recognizes the possible pressure that might be brought to bear on academics involved in industry to publish or withhold findings that are positive or negative to a specific industry. The problem is that "it is less clear how internally driven pressures from individuals involved in both sides of the research activities (academic and commercial) could be assessed" (Vallance, 2001:1805). The possibility "to publish data overtly supporting the position or product of the company," Vallence (2001:1805) argues, is likely to be substantial. But the possibility, as Vallence continues, could be monitored through the safety of the peer review process which would "ensure that only high quality data are published".

It is correct to argue that the peer review process could act as a safety net. However, in the face of competing journals, the peer review process cannot be a full-proof mechanism. Some leading journals, for instance, in medical research are becoming increasingly depended on funding from sponsors and not professional members. This is why questions are being raised about the nature of the relationship between journals, their contributors and the sponsors of their research. All the questions being raised revolve around conflicts of interests and accountability (See, for example, Editorials in *The New England Journal of Medicine* – especially Drazen and Curfman, 2002; Davidoff et. al., 2001, and Kassirer and Angell, 1993).

Closely tied to disclosure of research findings is the ownership of academic knowledge, especially in a global era (Polster, 2000). Academics in public institutions are, by definition, public employees and so it is fair to expect their work to be of some benefit to the public. The question then becomes, to what extent should the findings from public employees remain in the public domain, especially when they team up with private sector? Is there a threshold that defines where public-private partnerships can swing to? Perhaps, another critical issue is what research questions can be raised in the public-private partnership? These and several other questions have to be posed because of the different motivations that inform public and private involvement in research. One factor underlying the above questions is the basic-applied research dichotomy.

Basic research is often perceived as not fancy, esoteric and its curiosity driven nature is seen as wasteful, especially when research, in this day and age, is supposed to be efficient. Applied research is supposed to have a more direct benefit, more likely to reap benefits and so worth the investment. However, as Smol (1999:35) correctly argues, the "main difference between pure and applied research... [is] simply ... a matter of time." Chomsky (cited in White, 2000) cites technological developments in agri-business, computerization and the Internet as having their origins in public universities funded by the taxpayer. All these developments started as basic research but after some time, have become applied research, lending support to Smol's (1999:35) assertion. The point Chomsky makes, and an essential one, is that the "private sector is extremely happy to have cost socialized, paid for by the general public through taxes. They want profit privatized, but they want costs and risks socialized. So, vast state subsidies develop the

technology and the science of the future, and also, for course, risk protection" (cited in White, 2000:444).

Nobel Prize-winning biochemist Paul Berg, whose work laid the foundation for the current strides in biotech, also argues as follows: "The biotech revolution itself could not have happened had the whole thing been left up to industry. Venture capital people steered clear of anything that didn't have obvious commercial value or short-term impact. They didn't fund the basic research that made biotechnology possible" (cited in Turk, 2000:11; See also Aronowitz, 2000:19-20). If the current environment in which private for-profit organizations want to seek patents, retain intellectual profit and conduct research in secret surrounded the basic or applied research environment of yesteryears, the current dramatic strides in research could not have been possible. Similarly, it is theoretically possible that with the lack of a sizeable state investment in research and the dominance of private research funds, some forms of basic research today, could be minimized or discouraged. Should that happen, it suggests that some possibilities of further or future advances in applied research and knowledge accumulation could also be foreclosed.

The analysis suggests that the nature of the relationship between public-cum-private cost and benefits in the production and propagation of research findings and the implications for institutions of higher educators, learners and society at large, cannot be benign. For universities and colleges, the desire for commercial support could well compromise the integrity of the institution. Being depended on the funds, the institution cannot boldly "articulate the inviolability of research integrity as an imperative condition in its negotiations with external partners for funding" (Tettey and Puplampu, 2000:87).

As far as teaching is concerned, educators (read as researchers), especially part-time instructors, concerned about how to keep their students (read as customers happy) would become no more than "clerks selling degrees"(Lerych, 2001:12). Learners would be exposed to knowledge that is dogmatic and uncritical in nature and the market importance would permeate the relationship between the educator and the learner. The free market arrangement, often touted as enabling us to exercise our choices, could also, in extreme cases, become constraining. Chomsky (in White, 2000:450) recounts the case of

> an undergraduate student [who] refused to answer a question on an exam in the computer science department [at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology] and when he was asked why, he said that he was under a condition set by a professor with whom he was working. He knew the answer, he said, but the answer was worked out in some project on which he was working under some professor who was intending to begin a startup company which would use the research they were doing and didn't want anybody to know about it (See also Press and Washburn, 2000 and Berman, 1998).

In such an environment, inter-faculty sharing of ideas would be kept to the minimum and also would be faculty-student dialogue. The common effect would be that the knowledge pool that could emerge through vigorous dialogue would become the poorer.

For society at large, the social good, for instance, that public universities serve would be in serious jeopardy. The "subversive character" (Chomsky in White, 2000:442) of universities is more likely to be undermined once the state, in reducing its role in universities, gives way to for-profit organizations, who, in turn, would dictate the nature of the research enterprise. Once universities cease being "subversive", there is the possibility that the knowledge they produce cannot be interrogated and its critical edge cannot be realized and with that, we are likely to have a docile, compliant and uncritical citizenry.

E. Conclusion

This chapter offered a theoretical analysis of the changing role of the state, the nature of social differentiation and the role of non-state actors in the academy. The chapter argued that even though the role of the Canadian state has been undergoing some changes, it remains the site for educational policy making. Indeed, the globalizing tendencies all require a state structure to work with. The existence of the Canadian state and its role, no matter how minimal, in education policy, raises some practical questions for globalization. In any case, the state of higher education throughout the country was analyzed with reference to equity and affordability. With increasing tuition rates, not only is equity a patchwork all over the country, but also affordability to higher education across social classes is becoming a problem.

The arrival of part-time instructors, the chapter also showed, have significant implications for the academy. Starting from what they teach, how they teach, their interaction with administrators, full-time instructors and learners, the positive and negative aspects of the work of sessionals in the academy were identified and discussed. Sessional instructors work under trying conditions, yet they have to excel if they are to have any chance of being appointed the next academic year. They, by teaching large classes, generate substantial revenue for their institutions. Sessional instructors also come in different forms – gender, race and ethnicity. The chapter also showed the role of politics in the hiring of sessional instructors and even full-time instructors.

For-profit organizations have also made considerable inroads into the academy. For some institutions, the interaction with profit seeking organizations has not been trouble free. From the Olivieri-Apotex disagreement at the University of Toronto to the

disastrous showing of the programs at the Telus Centre, it is fair to say, there are challenges ahead and we also do not know the future trajectories of current trends. With the analysis in this chapter as the background, the next and final chapter provides a summary and reflections on the study.

CHAPTER 4

SUMMARY AND POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

A. Summary

This chapter offers a summary of the study, a statement of the findings and some recommendations on educational policies. This study has examined the changing role of the state and non-state actors as well as educational policies in Canada. The broader context of the study was globalization, knowledge production and propagation, the fate of educators, learners and society at large. Educational policy is the product of several factors, some obvious and others not so obvious. Whether obvious or not, educational policies mirror the political, economic and socio-cultural realities of a society. The state has often been conceptualized as the main actor in the affairs of a society. However, the power of the state to bring about social change is often contested by other powerful sites, some of which are for-profit.

Institutions of higher education are embedded in the social fabric of their respective societies. Changes in the wider society would, by default, affect their operations. Hence, institutions of higher education have had to restructure, partly as a result of and as a response to wider social forces. In the process they are taking on a business model. In this model, the role of academic labourers, their reward and other aspects of their labour are supposed to be guided by the discipline of the market. However, the hiring and reward of part-time instructors is not entirely determined by market forces. Power and other ascribed variables are also at work.

The theoretical implications of these findings are clear. For example, one specific theoretical perspective cannot reasonably account for the complexity of social issues. In

this particular study, it was shown that for both the proponents and opponents of the market model, theories of the state cannot satisfactorily account for all the forms of social differentiation and commodification in the academy. This suggests that the perspectives cannot, as single entities, address all the implications of the restructuring of higher education of learners and the society at large. In other words, the above theoretical perspectives can be enhanced if integrated with others, for instance, from cultural studies and network analysis. The study therefore lends some credibility to the on-going efforts at theoretical synthesis (Ritzer, 2000:491-508)

It is from integrative perspectives that we can better understand how the interaction among the state, non-state actors and the society at large can impact educational policy and vice versa. The theoretical argument of the study and the findings underscore two conclusions. First, the actions or inactions or the state, non-state actors and society can best be understood within a dynamic social context as far as educational policy and restructuring of higher education are concerned. Second, the impact of educational polices during the restructuring, for example, differentiation and commercialization of the academy, go beyond the respective institutions to include the broader society. If higher education remains the legitimate site for knowledge production and dissemination, then what is going in these institutions would eventually be reflected in the nature of the society in question.

The Canadian government, like its counterparts elsewhere, is interested in the contribution of higher education to societal well-being. That is why despite the prevailing calls for a minimal role for governments, the Canadian state continues to play a role in higher education. While the state's continuous involvement in higher education is a tacit

admission of its role in setting conditions for educational development, the problem has been that the state alone is not able to determine educational policies. Given the range of actors and their diverse objectives, it is clear that educational policies, in some cases, would be compromised in the final analysis. There is also the likelihood of winners and losers as far as specific educational policies are concerned. This study has shown that educational policy, its nature, form and impact is a theoretical and empirical problem that can be analysed by "understanding both why specific development strategies or options were adopted and, ... the consequences of [those] ....choices for political and economic change" (Kohli and Shue,1994:302).

B. Policy Recommendations

With the long-term well being of society at stake, the theoretical argument and analysis in this study engender several policy recommendations. First, following Aronowitz (2000), a major distinction needs to be made between the training and learning aspects of higher education and these distinctions need to be brought to bear on the mission of universities and colleges. Especially, for public institutions, their mission should be defined in ways that speak more to their public role than to the high sounding corporate (private) lingo within which many institutions currently define themselves. Learning is, obviously, a higher task that institutions of higher education need to aspire to infusing into their students. Even training should be premised on giving learners a rounded or holistic view of society by exploring diverse knowledge systems. For learning to take place in institutions of higher learning, curriculum reforms should not be informed by economic imperatives alone, but also be relevant to the lived experiences of learners.

This suggests that curriculum changes should endeavour to seek out and create new ways of knowing that would challenge the status quo. The curriculum, as Aronowitz (2000:168-169) correctly maintains, should "provide the student with a systematic, critical introduction to the intellectual traditions that inform or *challenge* the precepts of contemporary life" (italics added).

The ability to devise new ways of knowing would call for a heightened sense of awareness on the part of instructors. Full-time instructors, given their security of tenure and research programs, could create courses that cut across traditional disciplinary boundaries. To be fair, some full-time instructors are quite interested in creating interdisciplinary courses. The extent to which part-time instructors could help in the interdisciplinary agenda, however, remains a problem. They often teach first year introductory courses and there is no incentive for them to be innovative, lest it rattle the sensibilities of their "customers," the learners. The implications of that could affect their job opportunities in the future in that institution and beyond.

The extent to which curriculum changes can bring about real changes in higher education also calls for changes in the training of the trainers. Institutions of higher learning, in proposing interdisciplinary dialogue, must show a genuine commitment to creating new knowledge and, where possible, rewarding instructors who transcend disciplinary boundaries in their teaching and research. There is also the issue of the profile of the academic staff itself and how their own experiences would inform their teaching and research. Hiring a diversified teaching staff should not be an exercise in public relations. Academic hiring is not always about quality. It is also about the willingness of established and powerful academics to have in their midst instructors who,

in light of their own experiences, would engage in different research areas and employ different methodologies in doing so. Simply put, "the definition of quality work [upon which hiring decisions are based] has to transcend parochial epistemological and methodological perspectives. Academics need to be more flexible, inclusive, and receptive of views and research priorities that may not fit into the intellectual fads of the day" (Tettey and Puplampu, 2000:98-99).

Another key variable for effective higher education is leadership on the part of the state, the historical guardian of the public good, by way of resource flows. As Tudiver (1999:192) contends, government needs to set up "higher priorities for social spending, and renew a commitment to public financing of post-secondary education, *without requirements for commercialization*" (italics in the original). Put differently, government officials cannot keep reminding us about the need to possess knowledge in order to function effectively in our knowledge-driven society, while undermining the role of knowledge producing institutions. In the face of regional and institutional disparities in Canada, the need to have a viable framework that could address these disparities should occupy national and regional leaders.

Closely related to the above issue is the place and importance of knowledge, given that it has become increasingly commodified in our contemporary society. However, to a large extent, knowledge has always been commodified. The difference now is in the ownership of and access to knowledge. Public universities, historically, depended on public funds, and the state had a framework within which knowledge was kept within the public domain and used as such. With the state reducing its financing of public education and the universities increasingly relying on private sources of funds,

those sources, as would be expected, are keen on reaping the benefits of their investment in knowledge production.

The analysis from this study is not meant to downplay the importance of public-private collaboration in the mission of higher education. It suggests, however, that instead of accelerating the demise of public education on the altar of globalization, it should be strengthened in a manner that enables public educational institutions to align positively with private knowledge-production organizations. Obviously, policy-makers need to be aware of the intricate differences in mandate between public and private knowledge producing institutions so as to maintain the proper balance between the two. That realization is important, especially in an era when globalization and post-Fordist capitalism have eroded notions of geographical loyalty and commitment to society.

Second, the role of industry in the academy is something that needs to be carefully monitored. There is no question that academia and industry need one other, provided their respective agendas could be harnessed for the common good. Many private sector corporations have in-house researchers, but those corporations, especially in the pharmaceutical sector, "need the moral authority of independent university-based researchers to ensure studies are free of contaminating material influences which would undermine public confidence in their products" (Tudiver, 1999:180). In other words, the "[u]niversities ...must realize corporations need *them* – not the other way round" (Rubinstein,1999b:4 italics in original). However, in an environment where many of the supposedly independent university-based researchers obtain research funds from corporations and often have to sign confidential arrangements, the question is whether they can maintain their independence.

The issue of academia-industry relations requires what Olivieri calls "blind faith" (Rubinstein, 1999b:4). Blind faith assumes that profit-seeking corporations would always work for the public interest. Because of her own experiences in the Apotex case, Olivier argues "blind faith" is no longer an option. Thus, research-intensive institutions according to Olivieri "must write firm rules protecting themselves from private interests, and management must be willing to stand up and protect the integrity of their staff" (Rubinstein, 1999b:4). The firm rules can be implemented by mechanisms such as oversight committees. These committees and the involvement of the wider faculty in the activities of university spin-off companies, whilst potentially difficult, is a goal worth striving for. Part of the difficulty stems from issues of ownership that those faculty members who own spin-off companies might assert. In asserting control, the owners would also seek to protect their patents and other forms of intellectual property rights, even as they continue to use public resources. The need for university spin-off companies to be governed by a form of Code of Behaviour should be examined, and such codes if in place already, have to be enforceable and transparent. The idea here is not only one of integrity, but also one of accountability in the activities of the university and its affiliated industries.

Third, institutions of higher education in Canada need to acknowledge that the persistent differentiation in academic labour would, in the long-term, harm the nature of the academy. For example, in the area of knowledge production, if university researchers loose their independence and, with that, their critical edge, then the knowledge they produce cannot be differentiated from that of any in-house research output from any decent multinational corporation. The argument is not that interrogated knowledge is

superior to or better than an uninterrogated one. Rather, interrogated knowledge would have gone through some scrutiny and any potential negative aspects would have been removed or minimized. A multinational corporation would calculate any scrutiny in terms of the impact on profit and, hence is likely to avoid any lengthy or critical scrutiny if there is the remote possibility of a negative impact on the profit margin.

One potent force for change would be the full-time instructors, assuming they are able to transcend their own immediate benefits by looking into the future. As those who bear the full burden of the academic work, their willingness to form genuine partnership with the sessional instructors would send a strong signal to university administrators about the need to address the labour conditions of all academic labourers. The need for strong unions or collective bargaining agreement with in-built clauses protecting casual academic labourers is a way out. Unions, in our current neo-liberal age, are supposed to be historical relics. However, as some medical doctors in the United States of America are beginning to acknowledge, they have to unionize in order to contest the managed-care movement and restore their own economic and professional interests (Hurst, 2000:12; See also Whitney, 2001).

Specifically, the current attempts to unionize sessional instructors and teaching assistants could well offer us a glimpse into the organizational abilities of academic labourers, which would have implications for higher education. The case at Yale University in the latter part of the 1990s is worth noting (Nelson, 1997). Partnership between full-time and part-time instructors would therefore be one of the viable strategies to contest the power of university administrators, many of whom are beholden to funds from multinational corporations. It also seems that university administrators might not

realize the harm they inflict on their institutions by not effectively addressing social differentiation and commercialization of the academy, especially when some of the sessional instructors also happen to be their former students. Just imagine how a sessional instructor might feel should the same institution for which he or she has already been saving money by way of lower rewards and no benefits, still wants cash donations from him or her as an alumni.

Finally, the ongoing changes in the role of the state, higher education, due to or as result of globalization, would define the nature of society. Thus, non-state actors would continue to be important in our understanding of educational policies. However, since non-state actors come in various forms, the need for citizen engagement to critically scrutinize and interrogate the activities of other actors is crucial for sustaining a vibrant democratic discourse. The recent demonstrations by civil society organizations, for example, at the meetings of the World Trade Organization in Seattle in 1999, the Group of Eight industrialised countries at Genoa, Italy in 2001 and Kananaski, Canada in 2002 and at other world meetings organized by international institutions, are quite refreshing. Citizens are beginning to realize the extent to which their political representatives, at times, do not work on their behalf. If education is a political, economic and socio-cultural act, then all facets of society need to get involved. That would be one way of influencing and comprehending the future direction and role of higher education in our twenty-first century society.

REFERENCES

Adams, H. 1968. *The Education of Canadians 1800-1867 - The Roots of Separatism.* Montreal: Harvest House.

Allen, R.C. 1998. *The Employability of University Graduates in the Humanities, Social Sciences, and Education: Recent Statistical Evidence.* http://www.sshrc.ca/english/resnews/researchresults/allen.pdf

Altbach, P. G. 2001. "Higher Education and the WTO: Globalization Run Amok." *International Higher Education*, No. 23, Spring. (http://www.bc.edu/bc_org/avp/soe/chie/index.html)
---------- 1995. "Education and Neocolonialism." In Ashcroft, B, Griffiths, G. and Tiffin, H. (eds.) *The Postcolonial Studies Reader.* London and New York: Routledge, 452-456.

Anderson, B. 1991. *Imagined Communities.* London:Verso, 2nd Edition.

Apple, M.W. 2000. "Between Neoliberalism and Neoconservatism: Education and Conservatism in a Global Context." In Burbules, N.C. and Torres, C.A. eds. *Globalization and Education – Critical Perspectives.* New York: Routledge, 57-77.
----------1996. *Cultural Politics and Education.* New York: Teachers College Press.
----------1982. *Education and Power.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.

Aronowitz, S. 2000. *The Knowledge Factory: Dismantling the Corporate University and Creating True Higher Learning.* Boston: Beacon Press.

AUCC 2002. *Making Canada More Attractive to International Students.* Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada.
--------- 1998. *A Warm Welcome*? Ottawa: Association of Universities and Colleges in Canada.

Axelrod, P.D. 2002. *Values in Conflict: the University, the Marketplace and the Trials of Liberal Education.* Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.
---------- 1998. "Challenges to Liberal Education in an Age of Uncertainty." *Historical Studies in Education.* 10, 1&2, Spring and Fall, 1-19.

Barneston, B. 2000. "Higher Education in Alberta, 2000." In Doherty-Delorme, D. and Shaker, E. eds. *Missing Pieces II: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education.* Toronto:Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 41-43.

Berman, E.H. 1998. "The Entrepreneurial University: Macro and Micro Perspectives From the United States." In Currie, J. and Newson, J. eds.1998. *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, 213-233.

Boulding, E. 1988. *Building a Global Civic Culture : Education for an Interdependent World.* New York: Teachers College Press, Columbia University.

Bourdieu, P. 1990. *In Other Words: Essays Toward a Reflexive Sociology*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
---------- 1984. *Homo Academicus*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Bourdieu, P. and Passeron, J-C. 1990. *Reproduction in Education, Society and Culture*. London: Sage.

Brecher, B. Fleischmann, O. and Halliday, J. eds. 1996. *The University in a Liberal State*. Aldershot: Avebury.

Breuilly, J. 1994. *Nationalism and the State*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2nd Edition.

Brill-Edwards, M. 2000. "Private Interest and Public Peril at the Health Protection Branch." In Turk, J. ed. *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities.* Toronto: James Lorimer, 63-68.

Buchbinder, H. and Newson, J. 1990. "Corporate-university linkages in Canada: Transforming a public institution." *Higher Education*, 20, 355-379.

Buchbinder, H. and Rajapogal, P. 1996 "Canadian Universities: The Impact of Free Trade and Globalization." *Higher Education*. 31, 1996, 283-299.

Burbules N.C. and Torres, C.A. eds. 2000. *Globalization and Education: Critical Perspectives*. New York: Routledge.

Carnoy, M. 1998. "Globalization and Educational Reform." *Melbourne Studies in Education*, 39, No. 2. 21-40.

Caryle, E. 1999. "International Students: Cash Cows for Cash-Strapped Universities and Colleges." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 65-66.

Castells, M. 1997. *The Power of Identity*. Oxford: Blackwell.

CAUT, 2002a. "Settlement in Healy Legal Dispute a "Vindication." *CAUT News Release Online*, April 29.
---------- 2002b. "Dalhousie Profs on Strike." *CAUT Bulletin Online*. January Vol. 49, No. 3.
--------- 2002c "Toronto Settles Pension Dispute." *CAUT Bulletin Online*, May, Vol. 49, No. 5.
---------- 2002d. 'The General Agreement on Trade in Services: What's at Stake for Post-Secondary Education?" *CAUT Bulletin Online*, June 17.

---------- 2001a. "Simon Fraser University Accused of Hiring Bias." *CAUT Bulletin OnLine*, April, 48, 4.
---------- 20001b. "Alberta Okays First For-Profit University." *CAUT Now*! Vol. 3, No. 1.
---------- 2001c "Part-Timers Organize at Wilfrid Laurier University." *CAUT Bulletin*, January, 1.
---------- 2000a. "The Funding Gap: Government Expenditures on Post-Secondary Education, 1999-00." *CAUT Education Bulletin* Vol. 2, No. 3.
---------- 2000b. "Government expenditures on post-secondary education, 2000-01." *CAUT Education Bulletin*. Vol. 3, No. 3.
---------- 2000c. "York Staff on Strike." *CAUT Bulletin Online* December.
---------- 2000d. "All Ends Well for Dr.Chun." *CAUT Bulletin Online*. Oct. Vol.47, No. 8.

Chan, S. and Fung, V. 2000. "Business faculty kicks it new school" *The Gateway*, Oct. 3, 1.

Charlton, C. 2000. "Ontario." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. *Missing Pieces II: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*. Toronto:Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives, 30-33.

Chomsky, N. 1994. *World Orders Old and New*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Clark, E. Ann. 2000. "Academia in the Service of Industry: The Ag Biotech Model." In Turk, J. ed. 69-86.

Clifton, R.A. and Rubenstein, H. 2002. *Collegial Models for Enhancing the Performance of University Professors*. Vancouver: The Fraser Institute (Digital Publication).

Clifton, R.A., Gregor, A.D. and Roberts, L.W.1996 "Introduction." Clifton, Gregor and Roberts, eds. *The Canadian University in the Twenty-First Century*. Winnipeg: The University of Manitoba (Research Monographs in Higher Education, No. 3).

Cobban, A. B. 1988. *The Medieval English Universities: Oxford and Cambridge to c. 1500.* Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Collins, R. 1994. *The Four Sociological Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Coser, L.A. 1977. *Masters of Sociological Thought – Ideas in Historical and Social Context*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

Coulson, A.J. 2001. "Market Education and the Public Good." In Hepburn, C.R. ed. *Can the Market Save Our Schools*? Vancouver: The Fraser Institute, 53-72.
---------- 1999. *Market Education: The Unknown History*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.

Cox, A.M. 2000. "Study Shows Colleges' Dependence on Their Part-Time Instructors." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. December 1, A12.

Currie, J. and Newson, J. eds.1998. *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications.

Davidoff, F. et al. 2001. "Sponsorship, Authorship, and Accountability." *New England Journal of Medicine*. Vol. 345, No. 11, Sept. 13, 825-827.

Denzin, N. 1970. *The Research Act: A Theoretical Introduction to Sociological Methods*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing.

Denzin, N. K and Lincoln, Y.S. eds. 2000.*The Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA : Sage Publications, 2nd Edition.

DiCenzo, D. 2001. "A Matter of Degrees – The Arrival of the for-profit university could spell the end of publicly funded education." *University of Alberta Folio*, April 6. [http://www.ualberta.ca/FOLIO/0001/04.06/focus.html]

Doherty-Delorme D. and Shaker, E. eds. 2002. *Missing Pieces III: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*.Toronto:Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
---------- 2000. *Missing Pieces II: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*.Toronto:Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.
---------- 1999. *Missing Pieces: An Alternative Guide to Canadian Post-Secondary Education*.Toronto:Canadian Centre for Policy Alternatives.

Doherty-Delorme D., Shaker, E. and Gillies. 2000. "Provincial Rankings." In Doherty-Delorme D. and Shaker, E. eds 9-14.

Dorrance, N. 2000. "For a Few Dollars More..." *Queen's Alumni Review*, January/February, 13-16.
---------- 1999. "Liberal Arts: Irrelevant or Irreplaceable?" *Queen's Alumni Review*, March/April, 5-6.

Drache, D. and Gertler, M.S. (eds.) 1991. *The New Era of Global Competition: State Policy and Market Power*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Drazen, J.M. and Curfman, G.B. 2002. "Financial Association of Authors." *New England Journal of Medicine*, Vol. 346. No. 24, June 13, 1901-1902.

D'Souza, D. 1991. *Illiberal Education - The Politics of Race and Sex on Campus*. New York: The Free Press.

Emberley, P.C. 1997. *The Role of Political Correctness in the decline of Liberal Education*. Ottawa: Centre for Renewal of Public Policy.

Engels, F. 1986. *The Origin of the Family, Private Property and the State.* Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.

Evans, P.B., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. eds. *Bringing the State Back In.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fisher, D. and Rubenson, K. 1998. "The Changing Political Economy: The Private and Public Lives of Canadian Universities." In Currie, J. and Newson, J. eds.1998. *Universities and Globalization: Critical Perspectives.* Thousand Oaks, Sage Publications, 77-98.

Flecker, K. 2000. "The face of the faculty is still mainly white." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds., 71-74.

Foucault, M. 1982. "The Subject and Power." In Drefyus, H.C and P. Rabinow, eds. *Michel Foucault: Beyond Structuralism and Hermeneutics*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

---------- 1980. *Power and Knowledge* New York: Pantheon Books.

Frankman, M. 2000. "Cash Appeal - Privatization Pipe Dream at McGill." *CAUT BULLETIN*, February, 3.

Gamson, Z.F. 1998. "The Stratification of the Academy." In Martin, R. ed. *Chalk Lines – The Politics of Work in the Managed University.* Durham: Duke University Press, 103-111.

Gellner, E. 1983. *Nations and Nationalism*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Gerth, H.H. and Mills, C. Wright. 1946. *From Max Weber: Essays in Sociology*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Gibbins, R. and Youngman, L. 1996. *Mindscapes – Political Ideologies Towards the 21st Century*. Toronto: McGraw-Hill Ryerson.

Giddens, A. 1990. *The Consequences of Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Giroux, H.A. 2001.*Beyond the Corporate University: Culture and Pedagogy in the New Millennium*. Lanham, Md.: Rowman & Littlefield.

Giroux H.A. and P. McLaren, eds. 1989. *Critical Pedagogy, The State, and the Cultural Struggle*. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.

Granovetter, M. 1995. *Getting a Job: A Study of Contacts and Careers*. Chicago: Chicago University Press, 2nd Edition.

---------- 1983. "The Strength of Weak Ties: A Network Theory Revisited" In Collins, R. ed. *Sociological Theory – 1983*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 201-233.

Green, A. 1997. *Education, Globalization and the Nation State*. New York: St. Martins' Press.

Grossberg, L..1997. *Bringing it All Back Home: Essays on Cultural Studies*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

Guppy, N. and Davies, S. 1998. *Education in Canada: Recent Trends and Future Challenges*. Ottawa: Ministry of Industry.

Hall, S. 1992. *The Experience of Partnership in Education: Parents, Professionals, and Children*. Dereham, Norfolk: Peter Francis.

Hannah, E. Paul, L. and Vethamany-Globus, S. eds. 2002. *Women in the Canadian Academic Tundra : Challenging the Chill*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Hardy, G.H. 1942. *Bertrand Russell and Trinity*. London: Cambridge University Press.

Harvey, D. 1989. *The Condition of Postmodernity*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hashemi, A. 1999. "How Ontario's post-secondary education system rates (poorly) with the rest of Canada." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 29-31.

Haskins, C.H. 1965. *The Rise of Universities.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Hayhoe, R. ed. *Knowledge Across Cultures: Univerisities East and West*. Wuham: Hubei and Toronto: Hubei Education and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Presses.

Heilbroner, R. 1992. *Twenty-First Century Capitalism*. Concord, Ontario: Anansi Press.

Hepburn, C.R. ed. 2001. *Can the Market Save Our Schools*? Vancouver: The Fraser Institute.

Hobsbawm, E.J. 1991. *Nations and Nationalism since 1780 – Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
---------- and Ranger, T. 1997. eds. *The Invention of Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Horn, M. 1999. *Academic Freedom in Canada*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Hoxby, C.M. "Analyzing School Choice Reforms that Use America's Traditional Forms of Parental Choice." In Hepburn, C.R. ed, 75-99.

Huber, S. 2000. "Faculty Workers: Tenure on the Corporate Assembly Line." In White and Hauck, eds. 119-139.

Hurst, C.E. 2000. *Living Theory – The Application of Classical Social Theory to Contemporary Life*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Jameson, F. 1989. "Marxism and Postmodernism." *New Left Review*, 176, 31-45.

Jones, G.A. 1998 "University-Government Relations in Canada: A Brief Review of the "Traditional" Literature." In Jones, G.A. ed. *The University and the State: Reflections on the Canadian Experience*. Winnipeg: Centre for Higher Education Research and Development, No. 4, The Canadian Society for the Study of Higher Education, 5-30.

Kassirer, J.R. and Angell, M. 1993. "Financial Conflicts of Interest in Biomedical Research." *New England Journal of Medicine*. Vol. 329, No. 8, 570-571.

Khmelko, I. 1996. "Liberal Education in Practice." In Brecher, Fleischmann, Halliday, eds. 96-105.

Kiss, S. 1999. "Some good, some bad." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 39-40.

Kohli, A. and Shue, V. 1994. "State power and social forces: on political contention and accommodation in the Third World." In Migdal, Kohli and Shue, eds. 293-326.

Landsberg, M. 2000. "Two Institutions that Deserve Our Outrage." *Toronto Star*, Feb. 13, A2.

Larrain, J. 1989. *Theories of Development*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Laxer, G. "Surviving the Americanizing New Right." *Canadian Review of Sociology and Anthropology*. 37, 1, 55-75.

Leatherman, C. 2001. "Part-Time Faculty Members Try to Organize Nationally." *The Chronicle of Higher Education*. January 26, A12.

Legget, B. 1999. "The Case of a 'broadly based' education." *Queen's Alumni Review*, March/April, 7.

Lerych, L.D. 2001. "Meeting the Bottom Line in the College Biz." *Newsweek*. April 9, 12.

Maclean's Magazine. 2001. *Exclusive University Ranking – Special 2001 Edition* November, 19, 2001, Vol. 114, No. 47.

Marchak, P. M. 1991. *The Integrated Circus – The New Right and the Restructuring of Global Markets*. Montreal and Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Machperson, C. B. 1997. *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Mackintosh, M. 1990. "Abstract Markets and Real Needs." In Bernstein, H. et al. eds. *The Food Question: Profit versus People*? London: Earthscan Publications, 43-53.

Marino, J. 1995. "Clearcutting in the Groves of Academe." In Harrison, T. and Laxer, G. eds. *The Trojan Horse – Alberta and the Future of Canada*. Montreal: Black Rose Books, 209-222.

Martindale, D. 1981. *The Nature and Types of Sociological Theory*. Boston: Houghton Millin Company.

Marx, K. 1976. *Capital - A Critique of Political Economy - Volume One*. New York: Vintage Books.
---------- 1978. "Preface to A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy." In Tucker, R.C. ed. *The Marx-Engels Reader*, New York: W.W. Norton, 3-6.

Marx. K. and Engels, F. 1985 *The Communist Manifesto*. Harmondsworth: Penguin Books.
---------- 1978. *The German Ideology*. New York: International Publishers.

Maxwell, J. and Currie, S., 1984. *Partnership for Growth*. Montreal: Corporate-Higher Education Forum.

McLaren, P. 1998 *Life in Schools: An Introduction to Critical Pedagogy in the Foundations of Education*. New York: Longman, 3rd Edition.

Migdal, J.S., Kohli, A. and Shue, V. 1994. "Introduction: Developing a State-in-Society Perspective." In Migdal, J.S., Kohli, A. and Shue, V. eds. *State Power and Social Forces: Domination and Transformation in the Third World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-4.

Miller, S.M. 2001. "My Meritocratic Rise." *Tikkun*, March/April.
(htttp://www.tikkun.org)

Mittelman, J. H. 1997. "The Dynamics of Globalization." In Mittelman, J.H. ed. *Globalization – Critical Reflections*. Boulder and London: Lynne Rienner, 1-19.

Moody, B.M. 1989. "Acadia and the Great War." In Axelrod, P. and J.G. Reid, eds. *Youth, University and Canadian Society: Essays in the Social History of Higher Education*. Kingston-ON: McGill-Queen's University Press, 143-160.

Morrison, K. 1995. *Marx, Durkheim and Weber – Formations of Modern Social Thought*. London: Sage Publications.

Morrow, R. A. and Torres, C.A. 2000 "The State, Globalization, and Educational Policy." In Burbules and Torres, pg. 27-56.

Morton, W.L. 1979. "The Founding of the University of Manitoba: Born 25 years too soon?" In Gregor, A. and K. Wilson, eds. *Higher Education in Canada: Historical Perspectives* (Monographs in Education II). Winnipeg: University of Manitoba.

Mullens, A. 2001. "The Sessional Dilemma." *University Affairs*, May, 11-25.

Nathan, D.G. and Weatherall, D.J. 1999. "Academia and Industry: Lessons from the Unfortunate Events in Toronto." *The Lancet*, Vol. 353, March 6, 771-772.

Neatby, H.B. 1987. "The Historical Perspective." In Watson, C. ed. *Governments and Higher Education – The Legitimacy of Intervention*. Toronto: Higher Education Group, OSIE, 19-40.

Neave, G. and van Vught, F.A. eds. *Governments and Higher Education Relationships Across Three Continents: The Winds of Change*. Paris: IAU Press and Permagon.

Nelson, C. ed. 1997. *Will Teach for Food – Academic Labour in Crisis*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

New Trail, 1998. "A Commitment to Lifelong Learning." *New Trail*, Autumn, 37.

Newson, J. 1994. "Subordinating democracy: The Effects of Fiscal Retrenchment and University-Business Partnerships on Knowledge Creation and Knowledge Dissemination in Universities." *Higher Education*. 27, 141-161.

Noble, D.F. 2001. *Digital Diploma Mills: The Automation of Higher education*. New York: Monthly Review Press.
---------- 2000 "Digital Diploma Mills: Rehearsal for the Revolution." In Turk, J.L. ed. *The Corporate Campus – Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities*. Toronto: James Lorimer and Company (CAUT Series Title), 101-121.
----------1977. *America By Design: Science, Technology and the Rise of Corporate Capitalism*. New York: Alfred A, Knopf.

Norrie, K. 2000. "Arts degree an excellent investment." *Edmonton Journal*, Nov. 18, A:23.

Olivieri, N. 2000. "When Money and Truth Collide." In Turk, J. ed. 53-62.

Owram. D. 1998. "Professional development: the new challenge in higher education." *University of Alberta Folio*, Oct. 16, 5.

Pal, L. A. 1997. *Beyond Policy Analysis: Public Issue Management in Turbulent Times* Scarborough, Ont: ITP Nelson.

Parenti, M. 2000. "The Myth of the Liberal Campus." In White and Hauck, eds. 85-92.

Parmar, N. 2002. "Telus Centre Hangs Up." *The Gateway*, Feb. 14,1.

Polanyi, K. 1957. *The Great Transformation: The Political and Economic Origins of Our Time*. Boston: Beacon Press.

Polster, C. 2000. "The Advantages and Disadvantages of Corporate/University Links: What's wrong with this question." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 180-185.
---------- 1996. "Dismantling the liberal university: the state's new approach to academic research." In Brecher, Fleischmann, and Halliday eds. 106-121.

Press, E. and J. Washburn, 2000. "The Kept University." *The Atlantic Monthly*, Vol 285, No. 3, March, 39-54.

Puplampu, K.P and Codjoe, H.M. 2001. "Human Factor Studies and Social Conflict: A Socio-Historical and Comparative Analysis of the Racial and Ethnic Dimensions." In Adjibolosoo, S. ed. *Portraits of Human Behaviour and Performance: The Human Factor in Action*. Lanham: University Press of America, 79-108.

Qurike, L. 2000. "Access in Jeopardy? Social Class, Finances and University Attendance." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 63-70.

Rashdall, H.1929. "The Medieval Universities." In Tanner, J.R., Previté-Orton, Z.N. Brooke, eds. *The Cambridge Medieval History* New York: The Macmillan Co, VI, - Victory of the Papacy, 559-601.

Reich, R.B. 1992. *The Work of Nations – Preparing Ourselves for 21st Century Capitalism*. New York: Vintage Books.

Ricardo, D. 1962. "On the Principles of Political Economy and Taxation." In Sraffa, P. ed. *The Works and Correspondence of David Ricardo*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press for the Royal Economic Society, Volume 1.

Ritzer G. 2000. *Sociological Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 5th Edition.

Rubinstein, D. 1999a. "A Professor, His Periodicals, their Publication and Acquisition." *University of Alberta Folio*, Oct., 15, 3.
---------- 1999b. "Toronto Doctor Challenges Privatization of Knowledge" *University of Alberta Folio*, Dec. 10, 4.

Said, E. 1993. *Culture and Imperialism*. New York: Knopf.

Scarff, M. 2000. "The Full-Time Stress of Part-Time Professors." *Newsweek*, May 15, 10.

Shumar, W. 1997. *College for Sale – A Critique of the Commodification of Higher Education*. London: The Falmer Press.

Skocpol, T. 1985 "Bringing the State Back In: Strategies of Analysis in Current Research." In Evans, P.B., Rueschemeyer, D. and Skocpol, T. eds. *Bringing the State Back In*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 4-37.

Slaughter I. B. and Slaughter, J.B. 1988. "The Role of Universities in Conducting Education Research." In Justiz, M.J. and Bjork, L.G. eds. *Higher Education Research and Public Policy*. New York: American Council on Higher Education and Macmillan, 205-216.

Slaughter S. and Leslie, L.L. 2000. "Professors Going Pro: The Commercialization of Teaching, Research, and Service." In White and Hauck eds. 140-156.
---------- 1997. *Academic Capitalism Politics, Policies, and the Entrepreneurial University* Baltimore, Johns Hopkins University Press.

Smallman, V. 2000. "Casual labour in Canada's universities: A Growing Trend." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 53-56.

Smith, A. 1976. *An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2 Volumes (First Published 1776).

Smith, R. 1999. "Cutbacks at the library are an outrage." *The Gateway*, Oct. 28, 6.

Smol, J.P. 1999. "Convocation Address." *Queen's Alumni Review*, May/June, 34-35.

Soros, G. 1994. *Founder's Statement.* The Central European University Prospectus.

Spivak, G.C. 1994. "Can the Subaltern Speak? In Williams, P. and Chrisman, L. eds. *Colonial Discourse and Post-Colonial Theory – A Reader*. New York: Columbia University Press, 66-111.

Storm, C. ed. 1996. *Liberal Education and the Small University in Canada*. Montreal-Kingston: McGill-Queen's University Press.

Tanguay-Renaud, F. 2000 "No Exclusivity for Coca-Cola at McGill Or, the silent growth of campus corporatization." In Doherty-Delorme and Shaker, eds. 173-179.

Tanzer, W. 1995. "Globalizing the Economy: The Influence of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank." *Monthly Review*, 47, 4, Sept., 1-15.

Taylor, K.S. 1998. "Higher Education: From Craft-Production to Capitalist Enterprise?" *First Monday*, Vol. 3, No. 9, September 7.
(http://www.firstmonday.dk/issues/issues3_9/taylor/index/htm)

Tettey, W.J. 2001. "What Does It Mean to be African-Canadian: Conflicts in Representation, Identity, Integration and Community." In Taras, D. and Rasporich, B.

eds. *Passion for Identity – Canadian Studies for the 21st Century*. Toronto: Nelson, 4th Edition, 161-182.

Tettey, W.J. and Puplampu, K.P. 2000. "Social Science Research and the Africanist: The Need for Intellectual and Attitudinal Reconfiguration." *African Studies Review*, Vol. 43, No. 3, December, 81-102.

Thompson, J., Baird, P. and Downie, J. 2001. *The Olivieri Report : The Complete Text of the Report of the Independent Inquiry Commissioned by the CAUT*. Toronto: James Lorimer and the CAUT.

Tirelli, V. 1998. "Adjunct and More Adjuncts: Labor Segmentation and the Transformation of Higher Education." In Martin, R. ed. 181-201.

Toomey, G. 2001. "Life After Canada." *University Affairs*, January, 9-13.

Tschang, T.F. and Senta, T.D. eds. 2001. *Access to Knowledge: New Information Technologies and the Emergence of the Virtual University*. New York: Pergamon.

Tucker, C. 2001. "Canadian Studies Program being Axed." *The Gateway*, March 6, 1.

Tudiver, N. *Universities for Sale – Resisting Corporate Control Over Canadian Higher Education.* Toronto: James Lorimer and Co

Turk J. ed. *The Corporate Campus: Commercialization and the Dangers to Canada's Colleges and Universities* Toronto: James Lorimer.

Turner, J. 1998. *The Structure of Sociological Theory*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Publishing, 6th Edition.

Tyrrell, L.D. 2002. "Dean's Message" *Faculty of Medicine and Dentistry News - University of Alberta,* Vol. 4, No. 4, June.

UNESCO 1996. *Learning: The Treasures Within*. Paris: UNESCO.

Veblen, T. 1918. *The Higher Learning in America: Memorandum on the Conduct of Universities by Business Men*. New York: Augustus M. Kelley.

Wahlsten, D. 1998. "The Eugenics of John M. MacEachran Warrants Revocation of Honours." *History of Philosophy and Psychology Bulletin*, 10, 2, 22-25.
---------- 1997. "Leilani Muir versus the Philosopher King: Eugenics on Trail in Alberta." *Genetica*, 99, 185-198.

Wallace, R.A. and Wolf, A. 1999. *Contemporary Sociological Theory: Expanding the Classical Tradition*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall, 5th Edition.

Waters, M. 1995. *Globalization*. New York: Routledge.

Wee, E.L.2002. "Professor of Desperation." *The Washington Post*. July 21, W24.

Weiler, H. " Knowledge, Politics, and the Future of Higher Education." In Hayhoe, R. ed. *Knowledge Across Cultures: Univerisities East and West*. Wuham: Hubei and Toronto: Hubei Education and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education Presses, 4-29.

Wellman, B. 1983. "Network Analysis: Some Basic Principles." In Collns, R. ed. 155-200.

White, G. D. 2000. "Afterword. Business School: An Interview with Noam Chomsky." In White and Hauck, eds. 441-455.

White G.D. and Hauck, F.C. eds. 2000. *Campus, Inc. Corporate Power in the Ivory Tower*. Amherst, New York: Prometheus Books.

Whitney, W.T. Jr. 2001. "Market Failures in US Medicine." *Monthly Review*. Vol 52, No. 9, 41-45.

Winner, L. 2000. "Introducing the Automatic Professor Machine." In Turk, ed. 89-99.

World Bank, 1998.*The Financing and Management of Higher Education: A Status Report on Worldwide Reforms*. Washington: The World Bank.

Yankah, K. 1995. "Displaced Academies and the Quest for a New World Academic Order." *Africa Today*, 42, 3, 7-25.

Zinser E. A. and Lewis, P. H. 1988. "Censorship and Academic Freedom in Research," In Justiz, M.J. and Bjork, L.G. eds., *Higher Education Research and Public Policy*, New York: American Council on Higher Education and Macmillan, 217-262.